

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7917742

LITTLE, MICHAEL WILLIAM
OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR
DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT THE
SECONDARY LEVEL IN MICHIGAN.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, PH.D., 1970

University
Microfilms
International

300 N ZEEB ROAD ANN ARBOR MICHIGAN

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ☒.

1. Glossy photographs _____
2. Colored illustrations _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
6. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ☒ throughout

7. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
8. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
9. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available
from school or author _____
10. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text
follows _____
11. Poor carbon copy _____
12. Not original copy, several pages with blurred type _____
13. Appendix pages are poor copy _____
14. Original copy with light type _____
15. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
16. Other _____

OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR
DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT
THE SECONDARY LEVEL IN MICHIGAN

By

Michael W. Little

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1978

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL IN MICHIGAN

By

Michael W. Little

Purposes of the Study

The primary purpose of this descriptive study was to provide objectives and evaluative criteria for distributive education personnel and vocational education administrators in the State of Michigan. From the results of this study State Department Personnel and/or Distributive Educators were provided with essential information needed to evaluate programs. Once standards are accepted to measure particular criteria and objectives, the evaluation process may be completed.

Methods Used

The population for this study consisted of 423 secondary distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local directors of vocational programs. A proportionate sample of 123 respondents was randomly selected.

Part I of the survey was designed to elicit what objectives respondents believed to be most important in relation to their program. Part II was based on evaluative criteria and the relative importance of each criterion in respect to program objectives, respondents were then asked to rank the five most important objectives and criteria. The format for the rating scale ranged in value from one to six in importance. ("Extremely Important," "Very Important," "Fairly Important," "Important," "Somewhat Important," and "No Importance"). The chi-square test statistic (.05 level of significance) was used to determine differences in the opinions expressed by the respondents.

Summary of Findings

1. The five most important program objectives in the opinions of 123 (65 percent response) distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors were:

Overall Rank (By Respondents)	Objective
1	1-1 That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education Program.
2	1-12 That Distributive Education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural background.

Overall Rank (By Respondents)	Objective	
3	1-5	That the Distributive Education Program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen distributive occupational field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society. (Career and job potential.)
4	1-18	That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.
5	1-4	That the Distributive Education Program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.

2. The objectives appear to adequately encompass a secondary distributive education program. Substantial agreement existed between respondents. When asked to recommend additions to the list, few tasks were suggested or were already included in the current listing.
3. For the most part, distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors agree on the same objectives. However, using the mean average, distributive education coordinators believe that objective 1-18 "Students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work" is more important than do administrators and teachers. Whereas, local vocational administrators on the average, agree objective 1-12 "To serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds" to be more important than teachers and teacher-coordinators.

4. The five most important evaluative criteria in the opinion of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors were as follows:

Overall Rank by Respondents	Evaluative Criteria	
1	2-2	Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation.
2	2-1	Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.
3	2-16	Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station.
4	2-5	Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.
5	2-4	Instructional activities, methods and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.

5. The evaluative criteria appear to adequately encompass a secondary distributive education program. Substantial agreement existed between distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors. When asked to recommend additions to the list, respondents suggested few tasks that were not already included in the current listing or offered a variation similar to those mentioned.
6. In general, distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors agree on the same evaluative criteria. However, there is disagreement on criteria 2-7 "Extra class activities such as DECA and school store" are on the mean average rated more important

by administrators and teachers as compared to teacher-coordinators. Also, on the average, distributive education teachers rate evaluative criteria "Labor market behavior and importance of advisory committees" lower than coordinators and administrators.

7. For the most part, years of experience do not make a difference in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors.
8. Professional preparation does not make a difference in the opinions of distributive education teacher, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors.
9. Type of program offered has little effect on the opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors regarding program of objectives.
10. Type of program offered has little or no effect on the opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors regarding evaluative criteria.
11. Size of school has no effect between the opinions of respondents on objectives and evaluative criteria for three basic types of programs.
12. Years of experience in the present position has little or no effect on the opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors relative to program objectives and evaluative criteria.
13. Degree of professional preparation has little or no effect on the opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors relative to program objectives and evaluative criteria.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher wishes to express his gratitude to those who made this study possible.

To Dr. Peter Haines, my major adviser, who has given me a keen sense of professionalism and the encouragement needed to carry the project through.

To my committee members, Dr. Frank Bobbitt and Dr. Bruce Mitchell; also to Dr. Bixby Cooper who willingly replaced Dr. W. J. Crissy who passed away. Thank you for your guidance and constructive observations throughout the study.

Appreciation is also due to my many friends and family especially my mother. Thank you particularly to Kimberly and Bob. Your understanding and reassurance were a comfort in this undertaking.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	Page v
Chapter	
I. PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Hypotheses	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Assumptions	8
Need for the Study	9
Delimitations	13
Limitations	13
Definition of Terms	14
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
Studies by Professional Organizations Con- cerning the Development of Criteria for Business and Distributive Education Program	18
Studies in Distributive, Business and Office Education Concerning Criteria for the Evaluation of Ongoing Programs	20
Studies Concerning Criteria for the Evalu- ation of State and Local Vocational Education Programs	28
Studies Concerning the Development of Philo- sophy and Objectives of Distributive Education Programs and Other Related Research	35
Summary of Related Literature	37
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES	39
Population	39
Sample	39
Instrumentation	41
Design of Study	41
Null Hypotheses	42
Validation of Instrument and Pilot Study	43

Chapter	Page
Schedule of Distribution of the Opinionnaire	44
Analysis of Data	45
Statistical Package for the Social Sciences	45
Summary	45
IV. FINDINGS	46
The Respondents	47
Program Objectives for Secondary Distribu- tive Education Programs in the State of Michigan	49
Evaluative Criteria for Secondary Distri- butive Education Programs in the State of Michigan	59
Comparison of Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-Coordinators, and Local Vocational Directors. Opinions on the Importance of Selected Program Objectives and Evaluative Criteria	66
Program Objectives	66
Evaluative Criteria	67
Size of School	72
Years of Experience	76
Degree of Professional Preparation	82
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	94
The Problem	94
Research Procedures	95
Findings	96
Conclusions	103
Implications and Concluding Statement	104
Recommendations	106
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	108
Appendix B	110
Appendix C	116
Appendix D	123
Appendix E	126
Appendix F	131
Appendix G	135
Appendix H	139
BIBLIOGRAPHY	145

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Total Response by Type of Program (N=79) 65 Percent Response	47
2. Response by Size of School for Distributive Education Teachers and Teacher Coordinators (N=79)	48
3. Profile of Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-Coordinators, and Local Vocational Administrators (N=79)	50
4. Degree of Importance Attached to Program Objectives by All Respondents (N=79)	52
5. Ranking for Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-Coordinators, and Local Vocational Education Administrators of the Five Most Important Program Objectives	58
6. The Degree of Importance Attached to Evaluative Criteria by Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-Coordinators, and Local Vocational Directors (N=79)	60
7. Ranking by Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher Coordinators, and Local Vocational Education Administrators of the Five Most Important Evaluative Criteria (N=79)	65
8. Differences Between Type of Program Offered and the Respondents' Opinions on the Impor- tance of Program Objectives	68
9. Differences Between Type of Program Offered and the Respondents' Opinions on the Impor- tance of Evaluative Criteria	73
10. Differences Between Size of School and Respon- dents' Opinions on Program Objectives	77

Table		Page
11.	Differences Between Size of School and Respondents' Opinions on Evaluative Criteria . . .	80
12.	Differences Between Years of Experience and Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Program Objectives	83
13.	Differences Between Years of Experience and Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Evaluative Criteria	86
14.	Differences Between Professional Preparation and Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Program Objectives	89
15.	Differences Between Professional Preparation and Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Evaluative Criteria	92
16.	Total Responses for Degree of Importance Attached to Program Objectives	126
17.	Total Responses Attached to Degree of Importance for Evaluative Criteria	129
18.	Means and Standard Deviations for Local Vocational Education Administrators, DE Teacher Coordinators, and Teachers Regarding Program Objectives	131
19.	Means and Standard Deviations for Local Vocational Education Administrators, DE Teacher-Coordinators, and Teachers Regarding Evaluative Criteria	133
20.	Ranking for Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-Coordinators, and Local Vocational Education Administrators of Program Objectives	135
21.	Ranking for Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-Coordinators, and Local Vocational Education Administrators of Program Criteria	137

22.	Total Response for Differences Between Programs and Objective 1-9 that the Distributive Education Program Should be Sensitive to Changes in Distributive and Marketing Practices and Procedures as They are Affected by Societal, Economic, Technical, and Educational Developments, and Adapt to Such Changes	139
23.	Total Response for Differences Between Programs and Criteria 2-7 that Extra-Class Activities (Such as DECA & School Store) are Provided	140
24.	Total Response for Differences between Programs and Criteria 2-9 that Home, Business and Community Relations are Maintained on a Continual Basis	141
25.	Total Response for Differences Between Position and Criteria 2-7 that Extra-Class Activities (Such as DECA & School Store) are Provided	142
26.	Total Response for Differences Between Years of Experience and Objective 1-1 that Preparation for Gainful Employment and for Advancement in a Distributive Occupation is the Primary Goal of the Distributive Education Program	143
27.	Total Response for Differences Between Professional Preparation and Objective 1-12 to Serve Students of Diverse Talents, Abilities, Interests, and Cultural Backgrounds	144

CHAPTER I

PROBLEM

Introduction

Evaluation can play a significant role in improving instruction and initiating appropriate change for educational programs. Distributive Education teachers and teacher-coordinators would likely benefit if they examined their role in evaluation relative to their programs. Through evaluation, program strengths and weaknesses may be easily identified, thereby enabling more effective planning and improvement to take place. Furthermore, evaluation becomes all the more important due to the view of the American public towards education and recent Federal legislation requiring stricter accountability of funds by vocational education administrators.

Distributive Education personnel are in search of ways to improve programs for students preparing to enter distributive occupations. The question, "What are the differences between an effective program and an ineffective one?", is a fundamental issue of values not only to distributive educators, but also to other interested parties such as local administrators and concerned parents.

In an address at the Distributive Education Division of the 1976 AVA Convention, Dr. Richard Ruff of the Arizona Department of Education stated:

The challenge that is before you is to guarantee that the leadership for the critical examination of Distributive Education comes from the DE community. Do not forfeit that leadership because if you do not critically evaluate DE, someone else will!¹

In regard to Dr. Ruff's plea for critical examination of Distributive Education, evaluation is a necessary input for decision-making. Analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the program is mandatory. It thereby becomes essential "to choose a methodology of evaluation that will involve representatives of the interested groups in the actual collection of data."²

When evaluating, it is necessary to decide what is to be evaluated and what results would be accomplished by doing so. If a program is based on the evaluation of outcomes, it is essential that the process involve the measurement of the program against previously planned objectives. A major weakness in evaluating programs in the past has been the neglect by educators to state clearly what they expect to achieve. Inexactness in stating goals

¹Richard Ruff, Evaluation in Distributive Education A Challenge for the Future, address at the American Vocational Education Association Convention Division of Distributive Education, December 2, 1976. Houston, Texas.

²Tim L. Wentling and Tom E. Larson, Evaluating Occupational Education and Training Programs (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975).

and the clamor by the public regarding accountability may also attribute to the current popularity of performance or behavioral objectives in the assessment of educational programs.

Evaluation is a continuous process which may be established on a formal or informal basis. A casual observation by a Distributive Education teacher of the physical features of a program or watching students partaking in classroom activities has its importance as a value judgment, but it does not provide sufficient evidence for a decision. Nevertheless, informal evaluations, although well intended, are often used by local educational personnel or are neglected altogether. As Mazzara³ states, use of informal evaluations are often the situation with many states since they provide little ongoing formal evaluation. In addition, congressional criticism of the lack of systematic evaluation by states of their vocational educational programs has been to no avail. A noted Senator on the Senate Finance Committee called for:

. . . substantial reforms in vocational education legislation which would assure Congress that federal expenditures for vocational education are in fact achieving their objectives.⁴

³Andrew A. Mazzara, "Evaluation and Michigan Vocational Education," Journal of Michigan Industrial Education Society (February 1976):6

⁴Manpower and Vocational Education Weekly, Volume IV, November 5, 1975, p. 1.

A valid evaluation, as stated earlier, will include an assessment of program objectives. These should be measured to see if the program is a success in operational terms. The measurement of program objectives is often referred to as input to a program. Secondly, the evaluation should be in terms of both product and process. "The product is represented by student knowledge and skills, the process is the manner in which they attain those skills."⁵ For example, included in process is teacher performance, resource use, and student learning experiences. Product evaluation involves outcomes both intended and non-intended, and the costs involved in relation to program objectives.

There are a number of advantages that may be derived from program evaluation. One study conducted by the Illinois Department of Education rendered various benefits to local personnel through evaluation of occupational programs. They were as follows:

1. Data gathered is useful for justifying supply and equipment requests.
2. Component areas of strengths and weaknesses are identified for program improvement.
3. Staff and facility use are improved.
4. Evaluation results are used by the staff to improve planning.

⁵Jane Coviello, "Evaluation of Vocational Programs," Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan, Monograph, 1977 Series of Vocational Education Concepts.

5. Decisions are justified when based on evidence obtained through evaluation.⁶

The aforementioned benefits could give an evaluator a formal system of evaluation upon which to base judgements.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was to determine basic objectives or goals for all secondary distributive education programs under contract with the Michigan State Department of Education and to derive evaluation criteria.

The following were research questions to be answered:

1. What objectives are most important in considering the success of a distributive education program as determined by the distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors?
2. Do the objectives adequately encompass a secondary distributive education program?
3. To what extent do distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors agree on the same objectives?
4. What evaluative criteria are most important in considering the success of a distributive education program as determined by distributive education

⁶Coviello, op. cit.

teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors.

5. Do the evaluative criteria adequately encompass a secondary distributive education program?
6. To what extent do distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors agree upon the evaluative criteria for a distributive education program?
7. Do years of experience make a difference in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors?
8. Does the amount of professional preparation make a difference in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested:

H₁ To determine what differences between opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors regarding appropriate objectives and their relative importance affect three basic types of programs.

H₂ To determine differences between the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators,

and local vocational education directors regarding appropriate evaluative criteria and the relative importance of each evaluative criterion's affect upon three basic types of programs.

H₃ To determine what differences between personnel in various sizes of schools affect objectives and evaluative criteria.

H₄ To determine what differences of opinions between distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors can be found relative to years of experience.

H₅ To determine what differences of opinion between teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors can be found relative to the degree of professional preparation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to provide objectives and evaluative criteria for distributive education personnel and vocational education administrators in the State of Michigan. The evaluative criteria and program objectives were rated in importance according to types of programs offered--the cooperative education technique, the project laboratory method, or both.

From the results of this study State Department of Education personnel and/or distributive educators can be provided with essential information needed to evaluate

programs. Once standards are accepted to measure particular criteria and objectives, the evaluation process may be completed.

A second purpose of the study was to provide distributive education personnel with a factual and objective foundation for policy and practice based on the opinions of practitioners as well as experts in the field.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for this study:

1. Distributive Education teachers, teacher-coordinators and local vocational education directors may effectively rate the importance of objectives and evaluative criteria.
2. Given the objectives and criteria necessary for evaluating a secondary Distributive Education program, distributive educators and local vocational education directors will carry out the remaining aspects of the evaluative process.
3. Programs that are not under contract with the Michigan State Department of Education may use the same information for program evaluation.
4. That the cooperative education technique and project laboratory method are the two primary types of programs found in Michigan.

Need for the Study

National enrollments for Distributive Education on the secondary level have seen a tremendous growth in the past two decades. In Michigan alone, there were approximately 279 Distributive Education programs employing the cooperative education technique and project method with an enrollment of over 22,000 students in the 1977-78 school year.⁷

Concurrently with the development and expansion of new vocational Distributive Education programs, many technological changes have also taken place in the business and industrial environments.

In retrospect, it is important for evaluators to consider whether objectives and evaluative criteria used for programs in the past are indeed adequate for assessing programs in the present and future. The objectives for a Distributive Education co-op program may differ widely from those of a Distributive Education project lab in the instructor's own mind. Also, standards for criteria vary among leaders in the field.⁸

Therefore, with these new trends and differing views in the business and educational communities, it seems

⁷Michigan State Department of Education, Vocational Technical Services, Lansing, Michigan, "Career Education Planning District Summary," January 1978.

⁸Warren G. Meyer, "Evaluative Criteria for Distributive Education," Business Education Forum 15 (April 1961):11-25.

important to ascertain what objectives and evaluative criteria are considered. From this initial step an evaluative instrument may be further developed to provide information and improvements for future action.

The evaluation of educational programs is concerned with determining how well schools are meeting the philosophy and goals that have been established. Moreover, there is also a need not only to delineate the goals that are being accomplished, but also to determine the appropriateness of the goals. Consequently, re-evaluation of goals and objectives is a continuous process in meeting the needs of program assessment.

After objectives have been developed and prioritized, the next step in evaluation is to determine what criteria or aspects of the program should be evaluated. Shack further relates to this point by saying that "evaluation requires the formulation of criteria applicable to the established aims and objectives."⁹ In addition, Ristau and Falk believe that stated objectives are necessary to produce the criteria for the evaluation. As a result, the criteria allow "a measurement of the degree to which the stated objectives have been achieved."¹⁰

⁹Chrystine R. Shack, "The Conceptual Framework for the Evaluative Process," National Business Education Yearbook No. 7, Department of National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1969.

¹⁰Robert Ristau and Ruel Falk, "State and Local Preparation for Evaluation," National Business Education Yearbook No. 7, Department of National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1969.

In findings of the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments the United States Commissioner of Education received a large number of comments regarding criteria for determining effectiveness of vocational education programs.

Most comments expressed a preference for permitting states to make all decisions in this regard, or for having vocational education directors assume responsibility for determining how effectiveness is to be assessed.¹¹

The general issue of evaluation was an integral part of discussion at the summary meeting between the National Institute for Education and Vocational Education researchers.¹² During the session, twenty different issues were raised by participants. The one most frequently cited was the need for the development of model evaluation designs that could be used for self assessment by states and local programs. Essential to what could measure the impact of vocational education was the identification of educational indicators or criteria in addition to successful job placement.

Leaders in the field of Distributive Education also have varying opinions regarding valid criteria for evaluation of a Distributive Education program. The Weatherford

¹¹The Federal Register, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education, April 7, 1977.

¹²Paper presented on summary of the meeting between National Institute for Education and Vocational Education Researchers, May 20, 1976, Washington, D.C.

study (1974) stated student placement to be a valid criterion but in no way should it be considered the sole criterion. Other factors such as "satisfactory performance and job satisfaction of students" are just as valid.¹³

In this era of evaluation and accountability it is necessary to distinguish the effective from the ineffective instructional strategy. Teachers and administrators must proceed to use alternative plans in helping students complete the objectives that have been set forth. There is a moral as well as professional obligation to students and the public. Crawford and Meyer sum up the responsibility of Distributive Education in regard to evaluation. "All Distributive Education personnel in a state should share responsibility for program evaluation because evaluation at the local level is essential to an effective statewide evaluation of the entire program."¹⁴

Due to the large number of criteria and varying opinions of leaders on what criteria are needed for program evaluation, it is important that Distributive Education personnel and vocational education administrators have a valid set of criteria that can be used in the State of

¹³John Wilson Weatherford, Identification and Analysis of Issues in Distributive Education, Monograph #7 (Southwestern Publishing Co.).

¹⁴Lucy C. Crawford and Warren G. Meyer, Organization and Administration of Distributive Education (Columbus, Ohio: Charles R. Merrill Publishing Co., 1972).

Michigan consonant with program objectives. This study will enable Distributive Education teachers, teacher-coordinators and local vocational directors to develop a valid instrument to critically evaluate their programs.

Delimitations

This study was limited to the development of program objectives and evaluative criteria for the evaluation of secondary Distributive Education programs under contract with the Michigan State Department of Education.

This study involved Distributive Education teachers, teacher-coordinators and local vocational education directors in Michigan as respondents. It was deemed important for all Distributive Education teachers and teacher-coordinators and vocational education administrators to participate in evaluation. But, due to the large number of programs in the state and limitation of funds by this researcher, a sample was selected according to the size of school systems found in the state.

This study was concerned with secondary schools having either the cooperative education technique or project laboratory method consisting of the eleventh and twelfth grades.

Limitations

Distributive Education occurs at secondary, community college and adult levels. This study was limited to

secondary programs contracted with the Michigan State Department of Education.

A factor which might influence the results of the study is that first year teachers or administrators may not have sufficient experience to rate the importance of objectives and evaluative criteria for a Distributive Education program.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms used frequently in this study are defined below:

Area Skill Center: A specialized high school used principally for the provision of vocational education for persons who are available for study in preparation for entering the job market.

Distributive Education: A vocational program of study in marketing and distribution for the purpose of job preparation.

Distributive Education Teacher: A qualified vocationally certified teacher of Distributive Education instruction who does not coordinate classroom instruction with on-the-job training. This person teaches a block of two or more consecutive class periods per day.

Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinator: A qualified, vocationally certified teacher of Distributive Education instruction who supervises cooperative on-the-job training. For the purpose of this study, a Distributive

Education teacher-coordinator will be anyone so designated by his/her state department of education who has served at least one year.

The Cooperative Plan: An organizational pattern of instruction which involves regularly scheduled part-time employment and which gives students an opportunity to apply classroom learnings in practice. It enables them to develop occupational competencies through training on jobs related to their occupational interest.¹⁵

The Project Laboratory Plan: An organizational pattern of instruction which involves a series of group and/or individually designed learning activities and projects related to the field of marketing, merchandising and management and which are related to a student's occupational interests.¹⁶

Evaluation: The process of ascertaining or judging the value or amount of something by careful appraisal.¹⁷

Evaluative Criteria: Aspects of a program which are used as guides for attainment of program objectives.

¹⁵Lucy C. Crawford and Warren G. Meyer, Organization and Administration of Distributive Education (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1972), p. 11.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁷Jane Coviello, "Evaluation of Vocational Programs," Michigan Department of Education, Monograph 1977 Series of Vocational Education Concepts.

Program Objectives: Those skills, knowledge of concepts and/or activities that will enable learners to demonstrate their mastery.

Local Vocational Education Directors: A full or shared time administrator of vocational education programs within a school district.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Throughout the years there have been a number of studies and developmental guidelines created as instruments for evaluating Distributive Education programs on the secondary and post-secondary levels. The purpose of the studies was to formulate evaluative criteria which would assist Distributive Education personnel to make self-evaluation of their programs.

The criteria were often developed by various investigators making a comprehensive study of the literature related to the "best thought, practices, conditions and situations" in the field as identified by the experts. However, little has been done to derive from the experts which criteria based on the objectives of the program are best suited to local evaluation.

In recent years, in accordance with federal regulations, state departments of education have revised and improved methods of evaluation for vocational education programs. The development of procedures for local program self-evaluation has been an important part of this accountability thrust.

Various research related to the foregoing issues and the present study was categorized in the following way. First, was a review of studies by professional education organizations relating to the development of criteria for Distributive Education programs. Second, are doctoral studies in Distributive Education that have constructed criteria for the evaluation of ongoing programs. The third area consists of criteria established for the evaluation of state and local vocational education programs. Lastly is a discussion of research related to philosophy and objectives for Distributive Education programs.

Studies by Professional Organizations Concerning
the Development of Criteria for Business and
Distributive Education Program

Evaluative Criteria Section 4-4 DE evolved through the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation.¹ The criteria checklists used for evaluating secondary Distributive Education programs have been commonly employed by teams of evaluators to determine the effectiveness of various program aspects.

The checklists are composed of a statement of guiding principles concerning DE and seven parts which include organization, nature of offerings, physical

¹Evaluative Criteria, Distributive Education
Section 4-4, National Study of Secondary School Evaluation,
4th ed. (Washington, D.C., 1969), p. 356.

facilities, direction of learning, outcomes, special characteristics of DE, instruction and professional background of staff members.

Program philosophies and objectives are essential elements in the NASSE evaluation and are therefore carefully outlined in order that evaluators for the program may base their judgments.

The instrument is composed of a separate checklist for each of the seven categories of DE criteria. Checklists and evaluations are based on a four-point scale from excellent to poor. Furthermore, there are guiding statements on each part which allow for a more accurate evaluation of program characteristics.

The primary purpose of NASSE was to assist local school personnel and outside evaluation teams with a set of guiding principles, checklists and evaluation items.²

The Delta Pi Epsilon³ study produced an instrument that could be used for the evaluation of business education programs. The evaluative criteria developed from the study provided a basis from which business educators would judge the effectiveness of their department.

²Crawford and Meyer, Organization and Administration of Distributive Education (Columbus: Merrill Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 303-309.

³Delta Pi Epsilon (Tau Chapter), Evaluative Criteria for Business Departments of Secondary Schools, Monograph 90 (Chicago, Illinois: Southwestern Publishing Co.).

The evaluative criteria were categorized under the following thirteen headings: (1) Articulation with other departments within the school, (2) Club activities, (3) Community resources, (4) Curricula, (5) Equipment and its utilization, (6) Guidance practices, (7) Instructional materials, (8) Library materials and facilities, (9) Placement and followup, (10) Qualifications and professional growth of teachers, (11) Supervisory practices, (12) Teaching methods, and (13) Work experience.

The instrument provided sixty-six criterion statements following each of the thirteen mentioned headings. The criterion statements were supported by checklist items to allow the evaluator to determine whether or not the criteria were being met and to what extent.

Studies in Distributive, Business and
Office Education Concerning Criteria
for the Evaluation of
Ongoing Programs

In recent years terms such as "accountability" and "evaluation" have come to the forefront in education circles, thereby creating a relatively new phenomenon for educators. Gallup polls⁴ indicate the public's dissatisfaction with the quality of education offered in the nation's schools. School administrators have been put on the line; with declining enrollments budgets must be drawn

⁴"Ninth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." Jointly conducted by the Gallup Poll and the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Phi Delta Kappan, September 1977, Volume 59, No. 1.

tightly and outputs carefully scrutinized to show the public they are getting their money's worth.

However, all is not easily done. A wide variety of factors influence the product of our public schools. Johansen noted such factors in his evaluation study⁵ of thirty high school Distributive Education programs for the purpose of assessing strengths and weaknesses in Iowa DE programs. The study was divided into the following areas for evaluation purposes: (1) Organization, (2) Nature of offerings, (3) Physical facilities, (4) Instructional staff, (5) Instructional activities, (6) Instructional materials, and (7) Methods of evaluation.

Evaluations were made by Johansen by developing and using an evaluative instrument consisting of (1) Checklist statements used with the guiding principles as developed by the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation as a base for determining areas to be evaluated, (2) Specific criteria were developed for each of the checklist statements, and (3) Information sheets were prepared from which to obtain the data required for evaluation purposes.

The information sheets, guiding principles and specific criteria were used to develop individual school evaluations and a state summary evaluation for each of the

⁵Harold D. Johansen, "An Evaluation of the Federally Reimbursed Distributive Education Programs in Iowa High Schools with Specific Reference to the Evaluative Guides as Developed by the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1963), p. 196.

checklist statements. The Johansen study differs from the present study in that the evaluative criteria were not rated in importance according to objectives of the program by teachers and administrators.

G. P. Mock conducted a study⁶ that was a compilation of evaluative practices and procedures in fifteen part-time cooperative Distributive Education programs in the public secondary schools of Arkansas. Through the study, Mock made recommendations for the improvement of programs in the Arkansas schools.

The evaluative criteria developed by Logan (1952), which was similar to the Evaluative Criteria set by the NASSE, were selected, tried out and approved for the Mock study. The writer made three visits to the school to form an evaluating committee made up of two representatives of the school and two representatives of the local business community. The Mock study is similar to the present study in that evaluative criteria were developed for the evaluation of Distributive Education programs. However, in the present study objectives of DE will also be rated in importance with the criteria derived from Mock's study.

⁶G. P. Mock, "An Evaluative Study of the Federally Reimbursable Part-Time Cooperative Distributive Education Programs in the Public Secondary Schools of Arkansas" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1965), 202 pp.

The Bannister study⁷ produced an evaluation of facilities, equipment, and instructional resources for Distributive Education programs in the state of Arkansas. The study included the following: (1) Development of an instrument for evaluation, (2) Demonstration of the use of the instrument by the evaluation of selected DE programs, and (3) Made recommendations for improvement based on the findings.

An instrument containing a list of tentative criteria was devised from a survey of current literature and related studies in Distributive Education. The criteria were evaluated by a panel of 45 educators in the field of DE and on the basis of this evaluation an instrument was formulated. The instrument was used and demonstrated on twelve cooperative education DE programs in operation in Arkansas public schools during the year 1967-68.

Again, as in the previous studies, the Bannister study is similar to the present one in the development of evaluative criteria but it differs from the present study in comparing program objectives to evaluative criteria.

The growth of enrollments in two-year colleges added a new dimension to Distributive Education Programs.

⁷Talmdge E. Bannister, "Evaluation of Facilities, Equipment, and Instructional Resources in Distributive Education Programs in Arkansas" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1969).

Accordingly, the Whitted study⁸ was the first comprehensive evaluation of two year federally reimbursable programs in junior colleges. Whitted developed guidelines and used them as a set of criteria, an instrument, and a set of procedures for the use of departmental self-evaluation to provide administrators and Distributive Education teachers and teacher-coordinators with an objective, economical means of evaluating programs. The evaluative criteria developed for the study by Whitted were statements representing the best thought, practices, conditions and situations pertaining to Distributive Education programs in the junior colleges obtained from the current literature.

The statements were classified into eleven major categories which make up important elements of the junior college DE program. The categories were (1) Philosophy and objectives of Distributive Education, (2) Curriculum, (3) Administration, (4) Instruction, (5) Instructional methods and procedures, (6) Instructional materials, (7) Guidance, (8) Extra-curricular activities, (9) Staff, (10) Physical facilities and equipment, and (11) Business-community relations. The statements were then divided into sub categories to give adequate descriptions. The criteria were submitted to a group of Distributive Education educators for refinement and validation. The committee consisted of seven

⁸Mildred M. Whitted, "Criteria for the Evaluation of Two-Year Federally Reimbursable Distributive Education Programs in the Junior College" (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1969).

midwestern state supervisors of DE and two DE teacher coordinators from junior colleges. Teachers and coordinators from forty junior colleges used the instrument to evaluate their programs.

The Whitted study is similar to the present study in that evaluative criteria were developed and a review of Distributive Education objectives was performed; however, it differs from the present study in that objectives and criteria were not rated in importance in relation to each other. Further, the study was for post-secondary programs.

The Taylor⁹ study made a more specific reference to the determination of the practices, procedures, situations, conditions and other phenomena peculiar to and important in the development and operation of business and office education programs employing the cooperative part-time method of instruction in secondary schools. The study focused particularly on the development of standards for the evaluation of programs with the purpose of providing a basis for their improvement and advancement. The standards were developed for evaluation by their incorporation into an instrument.

The standards and instrument were validated by means of face validity. Validation procedures involved three

⁹Ruby F. Taylor, "Standards for the Evaluation of Business and Office Education Programs Employing the Cooperative Part-Time Method of Instruction in the Secondary Schools" (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1972).

select groups of practicing teacher-coordinators, a total of one hundred and thirty-four in forty-five states.

Luke¹⁰ focused more specifically on the development of a set of criteria to be used in evaluating an Office Production Laboratory, an in-school relevant work experience course in the office occupations at the secondary school level. An evaluation instrument and instructions for using the instrument were also developed in order that the criteria might be more usable.

Statements of optimum conditions, practices, procedures and situations were derived from the professional literature from 1960 to July 1972. The statements were then analyzed and classified into five major categories: (1) Administration and organization, (2) Class content and activities, (3) Facilities, equipment and supplies, (4) Students, and (5) Faculty.

The evaluative criteria were validated by teachers of the Office Production Laboratory, state directors of business and office education and college teachers. Teachers from five states were asked to use the criteria and instrument to evaluate the courses they were teaching. Criteria from the Luke study were further developed and used for the present study.

¹⁰Cheryl M. Luke, "Criteria for the Evaluation of the Office Production Laboratory at the Secondary School Level" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1973).

The Wyllie¹¹ study was developed for the evaluation of business education programs at the secondary school level. Through an extensive study of the literature Wyllie developed an instrument which was used to evaluate the following areas: (a) Curriculum, (b) Instructional content, (c) Instructional activities, methods and procedures, (d) Instructional materials, (e) Guidance, (f) Extra-class activities, (g) Home, business and community relations, (h) Physical facilities and equipment, and (i) Staff.

The instrument was constructed to include the foregoing criteria with supporting statements for each criterion. The criteria was later validated by business educators in the field.

The criteria were developed in a checklist fashion whereby the evaluator could determine how well or how poorly a standard was met. Business teachers were asked to evaluate their programs based on the criteria to indicate whether they were meeting established standards.

Many of the evaluation studies mentioned previously were validated by teachers and supervisors within the field of Business and Distributive Education. At the same time, there are other interested parties in the evaluative process.

Evaluation of Vocational Education programs also takes place on a statewide level. Furthermore, statewide

¹¹Eugene D. Wyllie, "Criteria for the Evaluation of Secondary School Business Education Programs" (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1961), p. 160.

evaluation for local school districts may provide much different insights. It therefore becomes necessary to study evaluation at this level.

Studies Concerning Criteria for the
Evaluation of State and Local
Vocational Education Programs

The following studies are concerned with the development and betterment of techniques which assist local school districts in the evaluation of occupational education programs. In determining a basis for evaluation design, attention should be given to two aspects:

1. Careful planning will be an essential part of any evaluation design, and
2. The participation of groups outside the educational community is expected if not already mandated.

In each of these studies, the aforementioned subjects are discussed only in relation to local program evaluation.

The Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction¹² study, revised edition, evolved criteria for the use of local school districts to evaluation business education programs. The purpose was to aid business education departments to identify strengths and weaknesses as measured against a set of standards.

¹²Criteria for the Use of a School District in
Evaluating Its Business Education Program, Revised Edition,
Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania,
1968, p. 8.

The Pennsylvania department instrument was used to evaluate the following areas: (1) Physical plant and equipment, (2) Organization and staff, (3) Bookkeeping, (4) Business mathematics, (5) General business, (6) Office practice, (7) Shorthand, (8) Typewriting, (9) Special counseling service, and (10) Community and school relations.

The Illinois State Department of Vocational Education¹³ study was a three phase system for statewide evaluation of occupational education programs. The purpose of the study was to (1) encourage better utilization of state and federal funds, and (2) to advance better planning and operation of local programs.

The first phase of the study consisted of program planning decisions made by local district personnel based on the results of previously conducted evaluation. The outcomes of the planning were reflected in the local districts' one and five year plans for occupational education and sent to the Division of Vocational and Technical Education. Phase two of the system included annual monitoring of program changes and progress reflected by state department personnel. Phase three comprised an on-site visitation of local programs by a visitation team consisting of

¹³Three Phase System for Statewide Evaluation of Occupational Education Programs, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Department of Education, Springfield, Illinois, 1976.

educators, business and industrial representatives and recent graduates of occupational programs.

The last phase resulted in identification of outstanding qualities and deficiencies in the occupational program, whereby specific recommendations for program improvement were needed.

The Ohio State Department of Education¹⁴ study also known as PRIDE--Program Review for Improvement, Development and Expansion in Vocational Education and Guidance--was developed to improve the quality of vocational education programs throughout the state of Ohio.

There are six components of the PRIDE program; they are as follows:

1. Administration Review--The role, objectives, structure and responsibilities of the administrative team are identified by a local district administrator.
2. Process Variable Review--Instructors use a lay advisory committee to react to the variables of an instructional program. The process variables (criteria) include curriculum and instruction, facilities and equipment, instructional staff and students.

¹⁴PRIDE--Program Review for Improvement, Development and Expansion in Vocational Education and Guidance, Division of Vocational Education and Division of Guidance and Testing, Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio, May 1976.

3. Product Review--The identification of the successes achieved by the vocational graduate through one and five year follow-up studies.
4. Cost Analysis Review--Identification of costs on a per pupil per program basis.
5. Availability and Impact Review--Conducted on a periodic basis by vocational education planning district personnel to utilize local resources for determining community needs.
6. Community Acceptance Review--Examination of pre-vocational education students to determine their interests and attitudes.

Additional reports are prepared by local vocational education personnel for individual programs providing information and data upon which decisions regarding improvement and deficiencies can occur.

The Virginia Department of Education¹⁵ study was developed for annual self-evaluation of vocational education programs by local school districts. Local self-evaluation was intended for across the board evaluation of total programs as well as various individual programs.

A systematic procedure was developed for planning and evaluation of vocational education programs to assist local school districts based on a five year state plan.

¹⁵Annual Local Self Evaluation of Vocational Education, Division of Vocational Education, Department of Education, Richmond, Virginia, 1977.

The evaluation procedure was developed into three major areas of vocational education--occupational preparation, consumer and homemaking education, and orientation of exploration programs. Evaluations were performed by committees composed of staff, present and former students, employers and other lay persons.

Harold Byram evolved a series of studies that laid a foundation for self-evaluation by school districts.¹⁶ This particular study was based on a clinical approach involving the demonstration of a system for the evaluation of vocational education on the local level. Other objectives of the study were to (1) discover and/or devise new or improved procedures for local program evaluation, (2) establish a working environment in which learning of evaluation procedures for both local school personnel and potential leaders at state and national levels of vocational education can take place, (3) identify and describe the role of the consultant in program evaluation, (4) uncover situations that would be considered as potential resource and development centers, and (5) further demonstrate and implement a plan for evaluation in the state of Michigan.

The study was conducted with the cooperation of ten school systems in Michigan. "The emphasis was on local

¹⁶Harold M. Byram, Evaluation Systems for Local Programs of Vocational-Technical Education (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, October 1968), p. 129.

staff and citizen involvement, curriculum analysis, assessment of outcomes through follow-up, and special projects and activities of interest to each school."¹⁷ From the study were developed a set of guidelines for local evaluation in addition to new and improved procedures for program assessment.

The Barrata¹⁸ study produced an empirical systematic method of weighting--prioritizing--sets of evaluative criteria as accepted by vocational education practitioners. Major objectives of the investigation were: (1) To report how well the Vocational Education Program Evaluation Inventory identifies criteria, (2) To evaluate and extend the delphi technique, and (3) To generate models to weight program evaluation criteria.

A modified delphi technique was used to arrive at a consensus among a representative sample of practitioners, experts and other related groups of subjects. The instrumentation and techniques used in the study to assess the importance of evaluative criteria was successful. Furthermore, the models used allowed for comparison of programs with differing sets of evaluative criteria.

¹⁷Byram, op. cit., p. 2.

¹⁸Mark K. Barrata, "Utilization of the Delphi Technique to Weight Program Evaluation Criteria in Vocational Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1974).

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction¹⁹

study was designed to validate systematic procedures and instrumentation for the evaluation of Capstone vocational programs for the purpose of program improvement. (Capstone classes include Distributive Education, Office Education, Trade and Industrial Education, Home Economics, and Agricultural Education taught in the eleventh and twelfth grades.)

Objectives of the study were to (1) develop a valid model for evaluating Capstone programs, (2) develop procedures which could be used to conduct self evaluation and visitation evaluation based on the model, and (3) construct an ongoing evaluation system that could be used in day to day management of Capstone programs.

The Capstone Program Evaluation System consisted of three phases:

1. Self Evaluation. Adapting and using the procedures and instrumentation contained in the Capstone Self Evaluation Manual, plan, conduct, and report a comprehensive self evaluation of the total Capstone Vocational Program.
2. External Evaluation. Adapting and using the procedures and instrumentation contained in the Capstone Team Visitation Guidelines, conduct an external

¹⁹Capstone Program Evaluation Model and Procedures, Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin, August 1977.

evaluation and receive a written report containing conclusions, recommendations, and suggested solutions for program improvement.

3. Implementation of Evaluation Findings. Using findings from the self evaluation and on-site team evaluation reports, develop short and long range plans for improvement of the program. Begin implementation of the planned program of improvement.

The study was pilot tested. Recording and monitoring of the pilot was done by DPI consultants and pilot school personnel. The Wisconsin Capstone model provided local vocational education directors with a tested program self evaluation model.

Studies Concerning the Development of Philosophy
and Objectives of Distributive Education
Programs and Other Related Research

A study completed by Crawford²⁰ is of special significance to this study. Prior to Crawford's work, little attention had been given to the validation of program objectives. The study was a major undertaking to develop a philosophy of Distributive Education by constructing and validating the basic beliefs regarding DE as determined by the entire population of state supervisors and teacher

²⁰Lucy C. Crawford, "A Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Education, Vol. I, Final Report of Research Project Supported by United States Office of Education Grant OE-6-85-044; Vol. I, 1967 (Blacksburg, Virginia: Virginia Polytechnica Institute, 1967)).

education personnel. The ultimate objective of the research project was to ascertain the learning experiences that should be included in a DE teacher education program.

A modification of Q-methodology was used to construct the philosophy. Statements of basic belief were carefully structured by Crawford with repeated reviews by a Committee of consultants. A basic belief card-sort of ninety-six statements were then constructed and tested. The basic beliefs that were agreed upon and later refined are found in Appendix A.

The Crawford study is directly related to the present study in that basic beliefs or objectives were constructed for a Distributive Education program by experts in the field. The objectives developed in the Crawford study were used in the present study to be rated in importance by DE personnel and local administrators with regard to evaluative criteria.

The Davis²¹ study concluded for the most part that cooperative Distributive Education programs in Indiana were meeting the philosophy established for them as perceived by students and teacher-coordinators. Program components that were investigated included the areas of objectives, guidance, curriculum and coordination.

²¹Rodney E. Davis, "The Extent to Which Indiana Distributive Education Programs are Achieving Program Philosophy as Perceived by Students and Teacher-Coordinators" (Ph.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1974).

Two survey instruments were developed to gather the evaluations of students and teacher-coordinators. The survey instruments consisted of forty-five statements derived from Lucy C. Crawford's study, "A Philosophy of Distributive Education," which was established as being equivalent to the Indiana DE philosophy.

Summary of Related Literature

Eighteen studies pertinent to evaluation have been summarized on the preceding pages. All of the studies, in some form, involved the use of objectives, evaluative criteria and instruments for evaluation of educational programs, and therefore have influenced the composition of the present study.

Meyer²² suggests that many changes have taken place within the occupational and educational environments and DE programs are in the midst of these changes. Meyer states, "Have these past experiences helped us to delineate the goals of Distributive Education?" Because of such changes it is important to continuously re-evaluate program goals in order that they reflect the times.

In many of the studies that have been reviewed, investigators have repeatedly developed a set of criteria, had it validated by a jury of experts, and then tested

²²Warren G. Meyer, "Re-evaluation of Distributive Education," Business Education Forum, January 1968, Volume 22, pp. 13-16.

on programs. Wall and Masterson make a good point when they say:

A jury of experts may have deemed the statement to be valid for instruction, but should it apply equally to school systems of various sizes, financial resources, student enrollment, level of offerings--elementary through college--and in all geographic locations?²³

In addition, the studies reviewed have also neglected an essential part of any evaluation, and that is relating program objectives to evaluative criteria. The present study will develop a list of objectives and evaluative criteria validated by experts as well as practitioners in the field. Specifically, Distributive Education teachers, teacher-coordinators and local vocational directors will rate objectives and evaluative criteria in importance among two basic types of programs.

²³Lewis Wall and A. C. Masterson, "Emerging Evaluation Approaches," Business Education Yearbook #7, 1968.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

In this chapter are described the selection of the participants, development of the instrument, design, and statistical techniques for analysis.

Population

The population for this study consisted of 423 secondary school Distributive Education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local directors of vocational education programs under contract with the Michigan State Department of Education. These groups were used to gain a perspective from practitioners in the field as to what were the most important objectives and evaluative criteria for Distributive Education Programs in Michigan. Lists were available from the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education and the State Department of Education for all secondary schools incorporating vocational education programs in Michigan which were eligible for reimbursement.

Sample

A proportionate sample of the population was selected. It consisted of 123 Distributive Education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational

directors whose programs were contracted with the Michigan State Department of Education were randomly selected. From the proportionate sample, twenty-five percent (N-36) of the Distributive Education Teachers and Teacher-Coordinators were selected from Class A High Schools, twenty-five percent (N-18) from Class B High Schools, and fifty percent (N-24) from C-D High Schools. This ratio corresponds with the size classifications of the 730 high schools found in Michigan. Twenty area skill centers were excluded in the size breakdown because they are specialized vocational high schools without competitive sports, however, they were placed in a separate category. Twenty-five vocational education administrators from a population of 100 were randomly selected since they were not associated with any one high school. (A list of participants is included in Appendix B.)

A school size classification was used to differentiate DE objectives and evaluative criteria among types of programs. The classification was based on the Michigan High School Athletics Association classified list of 730 Michigan high schools 1977-1978. The classification included: Class A, 1,430 or more, grades 9-12; Class B, 708-1,429, grades 9-12; and Class C & D, 0-707, grades 9-12. This classification was chosen based on a previous study by Uthe (1969) and discussions with Dr. William Rude, Executive Director of the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education and Dr. Peter G. Haines, major adviser for the present study.

Instrumentation

Because of the nature and scope of the investigation, an opinionnaire appeared to be the most economical and efficient method of gathering the primary data for this study.

Sources used for criteria and objectives were developed through a comprehensive study and analysis of literature related to the "best thoughts, articles, conditions, and situations in the field."

Through a discussion with doctoral committee members, it was decided the survey instrument should require respondents to (1) rate objectives and criteria on a scale from one to six, and (2) rank the five most important objectives and criteria relative to their programs. A copy of the opinionnaire may be found in Appendix C.

Part I of the survey instrument was designed to elicit what respondents believed to be the most important objectives in relation to their program. Part II was based on rankings by respondents of evaluative criteria and the relative importance of each criterion in respect to program objectives.

Design of Study

In this descriptive study two criterion variables and four predictor variables were used.

The criterion variables were objectives and evaluative criteria for distributive education programs developed from the "best thoughts, standards, and practices" found in the literature.

The predictor variables were program type, defined as co-operative, project method and both combined; size of school defined as Class A, Class B, Class C-D and Skill Center; years of experience of the teacher or administrator using the following categories were: 1-3 years, 4-8 years, 9-12 years, and over 12 years; and education was defined as type of degree attained: baccalaureate, masters, specialist, and doctorate.

Null Hypotheses

To determine if predictor variables affected the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational administrators the following null hypotheses were tested using a statistical analysis:

H_{0_1} There are no significant differences between the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors regarding appropriate objectives and their relative importance within each of three basic types of programs.

H_{0_2} There are no significant differences between the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors regarding appropriate evaluative criteria and the relative

importance of each criterion within each of three basic types of programs.

Ho₃ There are no significant differences between distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors in various sizes of schools regarding program objectives and evaluative criteria.

Ho₄ There are no significant differences of opinions between teachers, teacher-coordinators and local vocational directors relative to years of experience.

Ho₅ There are no significant differences of opinion between distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors relative to the degree of professional preparation.

Validation of Instrument and Pilot Study

The objectives and evaluative criteria used for the study were validated by a committee of experts who were considered leaders in the state and by practitioners in the state.

The committee of experts consisted of teacher education personnel and the state supervisor for Distributive Education in the State of Michigan. Representatives from the following institutions were involved: Central Michigan University, University of Michigan, Wayne State University, Western Michigan University, and the Michigan State Department of Education. Michigan State University

was excluded since the study was initiated from that institution. Practitioners included the Executive Board Members of the Michigan Association of Distributive Education Teachers (MADET). Objectives and criteria were revised based on the suggestions and recommendations made by the above mentioned groups. These educators were selected on the basis of their position, experience, and professional commitment to distributive education.

In order to determine the ability of respondents to answer questions correctly and that a proper statistic was used for analysis of data, a pilot study was conducted with distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors. Based on the results of the pilot study, appropriate refinements and adjustments were made.

Schedule of Distribution of the Opinionnaire

The first mailing of the opinionnaire was made on February 10, 1978, to distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors in the State of Michigan. The survey was designed to obtain responses related to the importance of objectives and criteria for distributive education programs as contracted with the Michigan Department of Education.

A follow-up letter was mailed March 8, 1978, to non-respondents of the first opinionnaire. Tabulation began one month after the follow-up.

Analysis of Data

Information received from respondents were analyzed by computer services at Michigan State University and the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Data was coded and transferred to computer data cards. The Chi-Square statistic was recommended by research consultants for purposes of the present study. A .05 level of significance was derived. Due to the phenomena within low cell counts, the gamma technique was used to further test the validity of statistical significance.

Summary

This chapter described the procedures followed to obtain necessary information for the study. Also described were selection of the participants, preparation for the opinionnaire and distribution and follow-up on returns of the two-part survey.

The opinionnaire survey was conducted in the State of Michigan only. In addition to data secured by the opinionnaire further information and background for the study was supplemented by a search of related literature, textbooks as well as personal interviews.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter is divided into four sections so that data can be separated into categories for ease of understanding and interpretation.

The first part presents background information on the respondents. The second part provides an over all ranking of the importance expressed by respondents on each of the selected 18 distributive education program objectives. The third part provides an over all ranking of the importance expressed by respondents on each of the selected 21 evaluative criteria. Frequency count and percent of response for objectives and criteria are also presented. Both the second part and the third part of this chapter relate directly to answering the research questions set forth in Chapter 1.

Further, this chapter reports the effect of the four predictor variables on 18 program objectives and 21 evaluative criteria. Each objective and criteria was tested using the chi-square test statistic to determine if there were significant differences (.05 level) among the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors.

The Respondents

The data in this study were compiled from the responses of 79 (65%) distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors or administrators who returned the opinionnaire sent to his/her respective school. The analysis of the first two hypotheses were based on data derived from three types of programs, that is cooperative, project or a combination of both.

The largest percentage of response was received from participants with cooperative education programs, 42 out of 79 or 53 percent. The next largest response was from those participants with a combination of both programs, co-op and project, 33 out of 79 or 41.8 percent. The smallest response was from participants of the project method with 4 out of 79 or 5 percent. The rate of response for each program is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1.--Total Response by Type of Program (N=79)^a
65 Percent Response.

Program	Frequency	Percent
Co-op	42	53.2
Project	4	5.0
Both	33	41.8
Total	79	100.0

^aThe original sample for 123.

The analysis of the third hypothesis was based on the variable size of school. Also included within this category were area skill centers. Classification of school sizes were based on the Michigan High School Athletic Association classified list of Michigan High Schools, 1977-1978. Skill Centers (20) were a separate category because they are specialized vocational schools where athletic sports do not function. In addition, only those skill centers were used that were contracted with the state department of education in Michigan.

The largest percentage of response was received from Class B schools, 13 out of 18 or 72.2 percent. A somewhat lesser percentage of responses was received from area skill centers, 13 out of 20 or 65 percent. Table 2 summarizes the response rate for distributive education teachers and teacher coordinators by school size.*

Table 2.--Response by Size of School for Distributive Education Teachers and Teacher Coordinators (N-79)

School Size	Responses	Percent	No Responses	Percent
Class A (1,430 or more)	25	71.4	10	28.6
Class B (708-1,429)	13	72.2	5	27.8
Class C-D (Less than 708)	16	66.6	8	33.4
Skill Centers	13	65.0	7	35.0

*(Vocational education directors were not included since they are not associated with any one high school.)

Table 3 illustrates the frequency count and percentage of response for the data collected concerning respondent characteristics.

Based on the levels most frequently selected for each of the variables in Table 3, better than half of the respondents were teacher coordinators, 4 out of 5 respondents were male, 4 out of 10 were between ages 25 and 34, 2 out of 3 had attained a masters degree, almost half had 4 to 8 years of experience in their present job, and 8 out of 10 had full vocational certification.

Program Objectives for Secondary Distributive
Education Programs in the
State of Michigan

Part one of the opinionnaire listed 18 program objectives of distributive education secondary programs. Teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education administrators were asked to express their opinions concerning the importance of these objectives in relation to the type of program offered. The following rating scale was provided:

- 1 - Extremely Important
- 2 - Very Important
- 3 - Fairly Important
- 4 - Important
- 5 - Somewhat Important
- 6 - No Importance

After completing the rating scale, respondents were asked to rank the five objectives they considered to be most

Table 3.--Profile of Distributive Education Teachers,
Teacher-Coordinators, and Local Vocational
Administrators (N=79).

Variable	Frequency	Percent of Response
Position		
Teacher	24	30.4
Teacher-Coordinator	43	54.4
Administrator	12	15.2
Total	79	100.0
Sex		
Male	69	87.3
Female	10	12.7
Total	79	100.0
Age		
24 or less	1	1.3
25 - 34	35	44.3
35 - 44	28	35.4
45 - 54	10	12.7
55 - over	5	6.3
Total	79	100.0
Level of Education		
Baccalaureate	18	22.8
Masters	49	62.0
Specialist	9	11.4
Doctorate	3	3.8
Total	79	100.0
Years of Experience		
1 - 3	10	12.7
4 - 8	39	49.3
9 - 12	19	24.1
over 12	11	13.9
Total	79	100.0
Vocational Certification Level		
Annual	1	1.3
Temporary	12	15.2
Full	66	83.5
Total	79	100.0

important. For analysis, the program objectives are categorized in the following way: 1 - Objectives related to job and career preparation, 2 - Curriculum and groups served, and 3 - Community and societal goals. Total responses for program objectives without a categorical breakdown may be found in Appendix E.

Initially, respondents were asked to rate the degree of importance attached to program objectives which is illustrated in Table 4. In the category "job and career preparation" 57 percent of the respondents believed that preparation for gainful employment was extremely important, but 34.2 percent felt it to be a very important objective for distributive education programs. This is interesting since distributive education is supposed to be a vocational program with employment as the main objective.

For the category, "curriculum and groups served," objective 1-12 to serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds was rated extremely important by 40.5 percent and 32.9 percent for very important by total respondents.

Objective 1-4 was not considered quite as important for the category, "community and societal goals." Thirty-eight percent of the respondents believed the encouragement and promotion in the use of ethical standards to be extremely important and 39.2 percent expressed very important.

Table 4.--Degree of Importance Attached to Program Objectives by All Respondents (N = 79).

Objectives	Extremely Important No. %		Very Important No. %		Fairly Important No.	to	No Importance %
<u>Job and Career Preparation</u>							
1-1 That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education Program.	45	57.0	27	34.2	7		8.8
1-5 That the Distributive Education Program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen distributive occupational field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of a society. (Career and job potential.)	33	41.8	33	41.8	13		16.5
1-18 That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.	28	25.4	34	43.0	17		31.5

Objectives		Extremely Important No. %	Very Important No. %	Fairly Important No.	to	No Importance %
1-7	That the Distributive Education program should provide training that results in increased efficiency in distribution and marketing.	26 32.9	22 27.8	31		39.3
1-11	That the Distributive Education should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.	15 19.0	30 38.0	34		42.1
<u>Curriculum and Groups Served</u>						
1-12	That the Distributive Education Program should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	32 40.5	26 32.9	21		26.6
1-10	That the Distributive Education Program should advance objectives of total educational programs.	18 22.8	32 40.5	29		36.7

Objectives	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important to		No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-6 That the Distributive Education Program prepare personnel to analyze consumer demand and satisfy the needs and wants of the consumers intelligently, efficiently, and pleasantly.	15	19.0	32	40.5	32			40.6
1-2 That the Distributive Education Program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise system as a cornerstone of the American Democracy.	15	19.0	29	36.7	35			44.4
1-17 That curriculum offering include career exploration at the elementary and junior high levels.	21	26.6	14	17.7	44			55.7
1-13 That the needs of adults in the local community be served.	5	6.3	24	30.4	50			62.3

Objectives	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important	to	No Importance
	No.	%	No.	%	No.		%
1-15 That the provisions for a local chapter of DECA and activities be established to foster such activities as: social skills, leadership abilities, communication skills, etc.	9	11.4	19	24.1	51		64.6
<u>Community and Societal Goals</u>							
1-4 That the Distributive Education Program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.	30	38.0	31	39.2	18		22.8
1-9 That the Distributive Education Program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by societal, economic, technical, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes.	19	24.1	30	38.0	30		38.0

Objectives	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important	to	No Importance
	No.	%	No.	%			
1-16 That provision for advisory committee members, school personnel, and other people from the community give input to operation and evaluation of the program.	18	22.8	27	34.2	34		43.6
1-3 That the Distributive Education Program should foster an awareness of the civic, social, and moral responsibilities of business to society.	15	19.0	27	34.2	37		46.9
1-14 That long range objectives be established to account for trends and changes that may affect clientele (e.g., population movement and economic conditions).	4	5.1	20	25.3	55		69.6

The above mentioned objectives appear to adequately encompass a secondary distributive education program as respondents were in general agreement and since few or no suggestions were added to the present list.

For the most part, distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators and local vocational administrators agree on the same objectives. However, on the average, distributive education coordinators believe that objective 1-18 (students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work) is more important than do administrators and teachers. This is particularly interesting since it could be interpreted that further education has a priority over immediate employment. Whereas, local vocational administrators on the average agree objective 1-12 to serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds to be more important than teachers and teacher-coordinators. The researcher found it surprising that only one out of five respondents gave objective 1-2 promoting free enterprise an extremely important rating. Findings for means and standard deviations for respondents may be found in Appendix F.

Subsequently, upon completing the rating scale, respondents were asked to rank the five most important objectives. A weighted arithmetic scale was used to determine the overall rank for each objective. The five most

important distributive education program objectives are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.--Ranking for Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-
Coordinators, and Local Vocational Education Administrators
of the Five Most Important Program Objectives.

Overall Rank		Objective	Weighted Arithmetic Scale ^a
1	1-1	That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education Program.	264
2	1-12	That Distributive Education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	136
3	1-5	That the Distributive Education program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen distributive occupational field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society. (Career and job potential)	134
4	1-18	That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.	80
5	1-4	That the Distributive Education program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.	77

^a Respondents were asked to rate the five most important objectives on a scale of 1-5. A weighted value of 5 was given to each objective ranked 1 in importance. A value of 4 was given to each objective ranked 2 in importance and so on, with a value of one given to the objective ranked 5 in importance.

The objective ranked most important for a distributive education program was preparation for gainful employment in a distributive occupation. A table presenting arithmetic weighted scale scores for all objectives may be found in Appendix G.

Evaluative Criteria for Secondary Distributive
Education Programs in the State of Michigan

Part two of the opinionnaire listed 21 evaluative criteria. Respondents were asked to rate the most important criteria on a scale of one to six as was the situation for program objectives. Evaluative criteria were categorized in the following way to avoid a long and cumbersome list. The categories are: 1 - Administration and organization of program, 2 - Class content and activities, 3 - Facilities, equipment, and supplies, 4 - Students, and 5 - Faculty and staff. Total responses for evaluative criteria without a categories breakdown may be found in Appendix E. The degree of importance of evaluative criteria for distributive education programs by teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational administrators appears in Table 6.

In the category "administration and organization," respondents rated evaluative criteria number 2-14--supervisory practices and administration very important or 45.8 percent. For the category "class content and activities" that instructional materials be current was rated as extremely important or 44.3 percent of the respondents.

Table 6.--The Degree of Importance Attached to Evaluative Criteria by Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-Coordinators, and Local Vocational Directors (N-79).

Evaluative Criteria	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important to of No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Administration and Organization</u>						
2-14 Supervisory practices/admini- stration flexibility meet student needs.	21	26.6	27	45.8	21	26.6
2-19 Philosophy and objectives of program are being met.	22	27.8	33	41.8	24	30.5
2-15 Organization of program is effective in facilitating instructional progress and program objectives.	23	29.1	30	38.0	26	33.0
2-17 Labor market behavior--avail- ability of jobs within community.	29	36.7	23	29.1	27	34.2
2-9 Home, business, and community relations are maintained on a continual basis.	14	17.7	28	35.4	37	46.9
2-11 Articulation--cooperation with other departments within school.	13	16.5	28	35.4	38	48.1
2-21 Advisory Committee functions and is used effectively.	17	21.5	20	25.3	42	53.1

Table 6.--Continued.

Evaluative Criteria	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important to of No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2-10 Community resources such as physical size, economic base, natural resources, and tax base are taken into consideration.	9	11.4	26	32.9	44	55.7
<u>Class Content and Activities</u>						
2-5 Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.	35	44.3	27	34.2	17	21.5
2-2 Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation.	30	38.0	29	36.7	20	25.4
2-4 Instructional activities, methods and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.	32	40.5	25	31.6	22	27.8
2-3 Instructional content is based on performance objectives.	18	22.8	33	41.8	28	35.5
2-7 Extra-class activities (DECA, school store) are provided.	14	17.7	22	27.8	43	54.5

Table 6.--Continued.

Evaluative Criteria	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important to of No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Facilities and Equipment</u>						
2-1 Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.	30	38.0	33	41.8	16	20.2
2-12 Library materials and facilities are provided on a centralized or decentralized basis.	10	12.7	20	25.3	49	62.0
<u>Students</u>						
2-16 Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station.	45	57.0	25	31.6	9	11.4
2-18 Student outcomes--job satisfaction (e.g., students obtain, hold, and advance in jobs related to field of preparation.)	22	27.8	38	48.1	19	24.1

Table 6.--Continued.

Evaluative Criteria	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important to of No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Faculty and Staff</u>						
2-6 Guidance aspects--such as counseling--are provided by teacher coordinator, employers, and guidance counselors (e.g., students have a career objective).	30	37.9	37	46.8	12	15.2
2-13 Qualifications and professional growth of teachers is maintained and updated to insure program quality.	25	31.6	29	36.7	25	31.6
2-8 Adequate staff are provided in order that all responsibilities of the job are accomplished.	31	39.2	27	35.2	21	26.6
2-20 Placement and follow-up of graduates are maintained on a continual basis.	20	25.3	30	38.0	29	36.8

In category 3--"facilities and equipment" were rated extremely important or 38 percent and very important 41.8 percent by respondents. A substantial number of respondents rated the student's work experience, the best possible placement as extremely important or 54.9 percent of respondents for the category--students. Under the category faculty and staff, guidance aspects, such as counseling, were considered very important or 46.8 percent of the respondents.

The evaluative criteria listed above appear to adequately encompass a secondary distributive education program as respondents were in general agreement since few or no suggestions were added to the present list. The above rated criteria indicate that respondents would prefer to be evaluated on the mentioned characteristics.

In general, distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors agree on evaluative criteria. Nevertheless, on some criteria, the extent of agreement does differ, for example, on criteria 2-7--extra class activities such as DECA and the school store were on the average rated more important by administrators and teachers as compared to teacher-coordinators. This seems to indicate that distributive education teacher-coordinators do not care to be evaluated on this criterion or else do not believe in its importance. Also, on the average, distributive education teachers rate evaluative criteria--labor market behavior and the

importance of advisory committees lower than coordinators and administrators. This could also be due to their lack of time to be involved in such activities.

After completing the rating sheet, respondents were asked to rank the five most important evaluative criteria. A weighted arithmetic scale was used to determine the overall rank for each criteria. The five most important criteria are presented in Table 7.

Table 7.--Ranking by Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher Coordinators, and Local Vocational Education Administrators of the Five Most Important Evaluative Criteria. (N=79)

Overall Rank		Objective	Weighted Arithmetic Scale
1	2-2	Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation	134
2	2-1	Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.	123
3	2-16	Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station	117
4	2-5	Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.	104
5	2-4	Instructional activities, methods and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.	96

The criteria considered most important by respondents was that of curriculum being directly related to

requirements of an occupation. A table presenting arithmetic scores for all criteria may be found in Appendix G.

Comparison of Distributive Education Teachers,
Teacher-Coordimators, and Local Vocational
Directors. Opinions on the Importance
of Selected Program Objectives
and Evaluative Criteria

As stated in Chapter 3, four independent variables were selected to determine differences in the opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local vocational directors on the importance of 18 objectives and 21 evaluative criteria.

Program Objectives

The first null hypothesis was: There are no significant differences between distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local vocational directors on program objectives and their importance within each of three basic types of programs.

Of the respondents, 24 (30.4 percent) were teachers, 43 (54.5 percent) were teacher coordinators, and 12 (15.2 percent) were local vocational directors. The type of program offered in their school district would be the cooperative education technique, the project method, or both. Forty-two (53.2 percent) of the respondents offered cooperative education, 4 (5.1 percent) used the project method, and 33 (41.8 percent) used both methods.

A significant difference between type of program offered and the respondents' opinions on the importance of

program objectives was found on the following objective: 1-9 That the distributive education program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by societal, economic, technical, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes. In this case, the respondents were less in favor than on previous objectives.

The null hypotheses that there are no significant differences between distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors can be rejected for this objective. However, there were no significant differences based on opinions in regard to respondents' position for program objectives. The chi-square value for each of the program objectives on program and position is presented in Table 8.

Evaluative Criteria

The second null hypothesis was that there are no significant differences between the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors regarding the importance of evaluative criteria within each of three basic types of programs.

Of the respondents, 24 (30.4 percent) were teachers, 43 (54.4 percent) were teacher coordinators, and 12 (15.2 percent) were local vocational directors. The type of program offered in their school district would be the cooperative education technique, the project method, or

Table 8.--Differences Between Type of Program Offered and the Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Program Objectives.

Objective	PROGRAM		POSITION	
	Chi-Sq.	Sign.*** Level	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
1-1 That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education Program.	3.3086	NS**	3.7184	NS**
1-2 That the Distributive Education Program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise system as a cornerstone of the American Democracy.	.1147	NS	.9011	NS
1-3 That the Distributive Education Program should foster an awareness of the civic, social, and moral responsibilities of business to society.	1.3426	NS	1.0443	NS
1-4 That the Distributive Education Program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.	.0949	NS	3.0540	NS
1-5 That the Distributive Education Program should stimulate the student's interest to his chosen distributive occupation field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society. (Career and job potential.)	4.4583	NS	1.9333	NS

** NS = Not Significant

Table 8.--Continued.

Objective	PROGRAM		POSITION	
	Chi-Sq.	Sign.*** Level	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
1-6 That the Distributive Education Program should prepare distributive personnel to analyze consumer demand and to satisfy the needs and wants of consumers intelligently, efficiently, and pleasantly.	.1665	NS	2.8958	NS
1-7 That the Distributive Education Program should provide training that results in increased efficiency in distribution and marketing.	5.7282	NS	1.7279	NS
1-8 That the Distributive Education Program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.	1.0178	NS	.8634	NS
1-9 That the Distributive Education Program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by societal, economic, technical, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes.	7.9233	.01	2.5055	NS
1-10 That the Distributive Education Program should advance the objectives of the total educational program.	2.7040	NS	.9666	NS
1-11 That the Distributive Education Program should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.	3.2941	NS	1.3709	NS

Table 8.--Continued.

Objective	PROGRAM		POSITION	
	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
1-12 That Distributive Education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	1.2974	NS	.7253	NA
1-13 That education needs of adults in the local community should be served.	3.4027	NS	5.5669	NS
1-14 That long range objectives be established to account for trends and changes that may affect clientele (e.g., population movement and economic conditions).	1.2126	NS	.2773	NS
1-15 That provisions for a local chapter of DECA and activities be established to foster such activities as: social skills, leadership abilities, communications skills, etc.	1.2637	NS	4.0713	NS
1-16 That provision for advisory committee members, school personnel, and other people from the community give input to operation and evaluation of the program.	2.1772	NS	4.6397	NS
1-17 That curriculum offerings include career exploration at the elementary and junior high levels.	.8393	NS	.8422	NS

Table 8.--Continued.

Objective	PROGRAM		POSITION	
	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
1-18 That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.	3.1259	NS	1.2147	NS

***Chi-Square test statistics are illustrated in Appendix H, Table 2.

both. Forty-two (53.2 percent) of the respondents offered cooperative education, 4 (5.1 percent) used the project method, and (41.8 percent) used both methods.

A significant difference between type of program offered and the respondents opinions on the importance of evaluative criteria was found on criteria 2-7 and 2-9 for program and criteria 2-7 for position. Therefore, respondents do not totally support these activities.

Program

- 2-7 Extra-class activities (such as DECA and school store) are provided.
- 2-9 Home, business, and community relations are maintained on a continual basis.

Position

- 2-7 Extra-class activities (such as DECA and school store) are provided.

The null hypothesis that there are no significant differences between distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors can be rejected for these three criteria. Table 9 presents the chi-square value for each of the evaluative criteria by program and position.

Size of School

The third hypothesis tested was that there were no significant differences between distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors between size of school and how it effects opinions

Table 9.--Differences Between Type of Program Offered and the Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Evaluative Criteria.

Evaluative Criteria		PROGRAM		POSITION	
		Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
2-1	Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.	2.3236	NS	.5027	NS
2-2	Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation.	1.3595	NS	.6646	NS
2-3	Instructional content is based on performance objectives.	1.0366	NS	5.3164	NS
2-4	Instructional activities, methods, and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.	1.3683	NS	1.6125	NS
2-5	Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.	5.2599	NS	.2507	NS
2-6	Guidance aspects--such as counseling--are provided by teacher coordinator, employers, and guidance counselors (e.g., students have a career objective).	.3255	NS	.1119	NS
2-7	Extra-class activities (such as DECA, school store, etc.) are provided.	17.1594	.0002*	6.4966	.03**

*Chi-Square test statistic is illustrated in Appendix H, Table 22.

**Chi-Square test statistic is illustrated in Appendix H, Table 23.

Table 9.--Continued.

Evaluative Criteria		PROGRAM		POSITION	
		Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
2-8	Adequate staff are provided in order that all responsibilities of the job are accomplished.	4.0092	NS	1.8275	NS
2-9	Home, business, and community relations are maintained on a continual basis.	6.3450	.04***	1.0443	NS
2-10	Community resources such as physical size, economic base, natural resources, and tax base are taken into consideration.	.1059	NS	.8422	NS
2-11	Articulation--cooperation with other departments within the school.	.7399	NS	3.0804	NS
2-12	Library materials and facilities are provided on a centralized or decentralized basis.	.9070	NS	1.1356	NS
2-13	Qualifications and professional growth of teachers is maintained and updated to insure program quality.	.5723	NS	1.8946	NS
2-14	Supervisory practices/administration flexibility meet student needs.	2.7282	NS	1.7829	NS
2-15	Organization of program is effective in facilitating instructional progress and program objectives.	.6341	NS	.5583	NS

***Chi-Square test statistic is illustrated in Appendix H, Table 24.

Table 9.--Continued.

Evaluative Criteria	PROGRAM		POSITION	
	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
2-16 Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station.	.8923	NS	.9587	NS
2-17 Labor market behavior--availability of jobs within community.	.7094	NS	4.0870	NS
2-18 Student outcomes--job satisfaction (e.g., students obtain, hold, and advance in jobs related to field of preparation).	.3476	NS	2.0778	NS
2-19 Philosophy and objectives of program are being met.	2.5481	NS	2.0778	NS
2-20 Placement and follow-up of graduates are maintained on a continual basis.	1.5022	NS	2.4764	NS
2-21 Advisory Committee functions and is used effectively.	1.4860	NS	5.5818	NS

regarding program objectives and evaluation criteria between three basic types of programs.

Of the 79 responses, 25 (71.4 percent) were in Class A High Schools; 13 (72.2 percent) in Class B High Schools; 16 (66.6 percent) in Class C-D High Schools; and 13 (65 percent) in the special category area skill centers. There were no significant differences between the size of school on program objectives and evaluative criteria for three basic types of programs.

The null hypothesis that there are no significant differences between personnel in various sizes of schools regarding objectives and evaluative criteria between three basic types of programs failed to reject the null, therefore, there are no differences. Tables 10 and 11 present the chi-square value for program objectives and evaluative criteria.

Years of Experience

The fourth hypothesis was that there are no significant differences of opinion expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors relative to years of experience.

Of the 79 respondents, 10 (12.7 percent) had one to three years of experience at their present position; 39 (49.4 percent) had four to eight years of experience; 19 (24.1 percent) had nine to twelve years of experience at

Table 10.--Differences Between Size of School and Respondents' Opinions on Program Objectives.

Program Objective		Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
1-1	That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education program.	6.3164	NS
1-2	That the Distributive Education program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise system as a cornerstone of the American Democracy.	3.0283	NS
1-3	That the Distributive Education program should foster an awareness of the civic, social, and moral responsibilities of business to society.	2.3702	NS
1-4	That the Distributive Education program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.	3.7750	NS
1-5	That the Distributive Education program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen distributive occupational field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society. (Career and job potential)	3.1074	NS
1-6	That the Distributive Education program should prepare distributive personnel to analyze consumer demand and to satisfy the needs and wants of consumers intelligently, efficiently, and pleasantly.	2.5853	NS
1-7	That the Distributive Education program should provide training that results in increased efficiency in distribution and marketing.	.9747	NS
1-8	That the Distributive Education program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.	1.1145	NS

Table 10.--Continued.

	Program Objective	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
1-9	That the Distributive Education program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by societal, economic, technical, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes.	3.6552	NS
1-10	That the Distributive Education program should advance the objectives of the total educational program.	.6959	NS
1-11	That the Distributive Education program should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.	.8263	NS
1-12	That Distributive Education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	.4676	NS
1-13	That educational needs of adults in the local community should be served.	2.1658	NS
1-14	That long range objectives be established to account for trends and changes that may affect clientele (e.g., population movement and economic conditions).	.7239	NS
1-15	That provisions for a local chapter of DECA and activities be established to foster such activities as: social skills, leadership abilities, communication skills, etc.	3.6281	NS
1-16	That provisions for advisory committee members, school personnel, and other people from the community give input to operation and evaluation of the program.	3.4880	NS

Table 10.--Continued.

Program Objective	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
1-17 That curriculum offerings include career exploration at the elementary and junior high levels.	2.1980	NS
1-18 That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.	1.1757	NS

Table 11.-- Differences Between Size of School and Respondents' Opinions on Evaluative Criteria.

Evaluative Criteria		Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
2-1	Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.	4.2175	NS
2-2	Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation.	.2405	NS
2-3	Instructional content is based on performance objectives.	.0333	NS
2-4	Instructional activities, methods, and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.	2.0399	NS
2-5	Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.	3.3748	NS
2-6	Guidance aspects--such as counseling--are provided by teacher coordinator, employers, and guidance counselors (e.g., students have a career objective).	2.6712	NS
2-7	Extra-class activities (such as DECA, school store) are provided.	2.8368	NS
2-8	Adequate staff are provided in order that all responsibilities of the job are accomplished.	2.7549	NS
2-9	Home, business, and community relations are maintained on a continual basis.	2.7964	NS
2-10	Community resources such as physical size, economic base, natural resources, and tax base are taken into consideration.	6.8332	NS
2-11	Articulation--cooperation with other departments within school.	2.3141	NS

Table 11.--Continued.

Evaluative Criteria	Chi-Sq.	Sign. Level
2-12 Library materials and facilities are provided on a centralized or decentralized basis.	.4747	NS
2-13 Qualifications and professional growth of teachers is maintained and updated to insure program quality.	2.5533	NS
2-14 Supervisory practices/administration flexibility meet student needs.	7.0261	NS
2-15 Organization of program is effective in facilitating instruction progress and program objectives.	.6122	NS
2-16 Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station.	2.4980	NS
2-17 Labor market behavior--availability of jobs within community.	2.6745	NS
2-18 Student outcomes--job satisfaction (e.g., students obtain, hold, and advance in jobs related to field of preparation.	2.6454	NS
2-19 Philosophy and objectives of program are being met.	3.8124	NS
2-20 Placement and follow-up of graduates are maintained on a continual basis.	.8903	NS
2-21 Advisory committee functions and is used effectively.	3.2761	NS

their present position; and 11 (14.1 percent) had over twelve years of experience at their present position.

A significant difference between years of experience at the present position and the respondents opinions on program objectives and evaluative criteria was found on objective 1-1:

That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the distributive education program.

This means that considering there was an overwhelming number of people that agreed on the importance of this objective, the feeling however was not unanimous. The null hypothesis that there are no significant differences of opinions between teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors relative to years of experience can be rejected for objective 1-1. There were no significant differences found for evaluative criteria. Tables 12 and 13 present the chi-square value for each of the program objectives and evaluative criteria.

Degree of Professional Preparation

The last hypothesis tested the effect of the degree of professional preparation on opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors. Of the 79 respondents, 18 (22.8 percent) had the baccalaureate degree; 49 (62.0 percent) had the masters degree; 9 (11.4 percent) had the specialist degree; and 3 (3.8 percent) had the doctorate degree.

Table 12.--Differences Between Years of Experience and Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Program Objectives.

Objective		Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
1-1	That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education program.	7.4964	.02***
1-2	That the Distributive Education program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise system as a cornerstone of the American Democracy.	3.3930	NS
1-3	That the Distributive Education program should foster an awareness of the civic, social, and moral responsibilities of business to society.	.6451	NS
1-4	That the Distributive Education program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.	1.1878	NS
1-5	That the Distributive Education program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen distributive occupational field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society. (Career and job potential)	4.6197	NS
1-6	That the Distributive Education program should prepare distributive personnel to analyze consumer demand and to satisfy the needs and wants of consumers intelligently, efficiently, and pleasantly.	.0086	NS
1-7	That the Distributive Education program should provide training that results in increased efficiency in distribution and marketing.	.3960	NS
1-8	That the Distributive Education program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.	.4130	NS

***Chi-Square statistic is illustrated in Appendix H, Table 26.

Table 12.--Continued.

Objective	Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
1-9 That the Distributive Education program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by societal, economic, technical, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes.	1.7413	NS
1-10 That the Distributive Education program should advance the objectives of the total educational program.	1.3930	NS
1-11 That the Distributive Education program should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.	1.6019	NS
1-12 That Distributive Education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	6.6337	NS
1-13 That educational needs of adults in the local community should be served.	1.3930	NS
1-14 That long range objectives be established to account for trends and changes that may affect clientele (e.g., population movement and economic conditions).	.9753	NS
1-15 That provisions for a local chapter of DECA and activities be established to foster such activities as: social skills, leadership abilities, communications skills, etc.	1.3180	NS
1-16 That provisions for advisory committee members, school personnel, and other people from the community give input to operation and evaluation of the program.	.8489	NS

Table 12.--Continued.

Objective	Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
1-17 That curriculum offerings include career exploration at the elementary and junior high levels.	2.5098	NS
1-18 That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.	.9002	NS

Table 13.--Differences Between Years of Experience and Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Evaluative Criteria.

Criteria		Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
2-1	Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.	2.6861	NS
2-2	Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation.	.1805	NS
2-3	Instructional content is based on performance objectives.	1.3180	NS
2-4	Instructional activities, methods, and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.	.4930	NS
2-5	Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.	4.1341	NS
2-6	Guidance aspects--such as counseling--are provided by teacher coordinator, employers, and guidance counselors (e.g., students have a career objective).	2.3309	NS
2-7	Extra-class activities (such as DECA, school store) are provided.	2.9671	NS
2-8	Adequate staff are provided in order that all responsibilities of the job are accomplished.	.0776	NS
2-9	Home, business, and community relations are maintained on a continual basis.	1.3144	NS
2-10	Community resources such as physical size, economic base, natural resources, and tax base are taken into consideration.	.6393	NS
2-11	Articulation--cooperation with other departments within school.	1.8528	NS

Table 13.--Continued.

Criteria	Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
2-12 Library materials and facilities are provided on a centralized or decentralized basis.	1.5889	NS
2-13 Qualifications and professional growth of teachers is maintained and updated to insure program quality.	.9208	NS
2-14 Supervisory practices/administration flexibility meet student needs.	.2747	NS
2-15 Organization of program is effective in facilitating instruction progress and program objectives.	.3110	NS
2-16 Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station.	.1556	NS
2-17 Labor market behavior--availability of jobs within community.	3.1815	NS
2-18 Student outcomes--job satisfaction (e.g., students obtain, hold, and advance in jobs related to field of preparation.	3.8160	NS
2-19 Philosophy and objectives of program are being met.	1.2663	NS
2-20 Placement and follow-up of graduates are maintained on a continual basis.	1.3930	NS
2-21 Advisory committee functions and is used effectively.	1.3144	NS

A significant difference between the degree of professional preparation in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors was found on objective 1-12:

That distributive education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural background.

The null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in the opinions between teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors relative to the degree of professional preparation can be rejected on this objective. Thus, respondents with baccalaureate, masters, specialist, and doctoral degrees disagreed on the importance of this objective. Therefore as professional preparation increases, so does the importance of serving students of diverse needs. Tables 14 and 15 present the chi-square value for each of the 18 objectives and 21 evaluative criteria.

Table 14.--Differences Between Professional Preparation and Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Program Objectives.

Objective		Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
1-1	That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education Program.	1.1784	NS
1-2	That the Distributive Education program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise system as a cornerstone of the American Democracy.	.1994	NS
1-3	That the Distributive Education program should foster an awareness of the civic, social, and moral responsibilities of business to society.	.9299	NS
1-4	That the Distributive Education program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.	1.8185	NS
1-5	That the Distributive Education program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen distributive occupational field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society. (Career and job potential)	4.8260	NS
1-6	That the Distributive Education program should prepare distributive personnel to analyze consumer demand and to satisfy the needs and wants of consumers intelligently, efficiently, and pleasantly.	2.0277	NS
1-7	That the Distributive Education program should provide training that results in increased efficiency in distribution and marketing.	.8505	NS
1-8	That the Distributive Education program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.	4.5436	NS

Table 14.--Continued.

	Objective	Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
1-9	That the Distributive Education program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by societal, economic, technical, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes.	.4423	NS
1-10	That the Distributive Education program should advance the objectives of the total educational program.	4.9122	NS
1-11	That the Distributive Education program should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.	.0243	NS
1-12	That Distributive Education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	7.8395	.02*****
1-13	That educational needs of adults in the local community should be served.	.9374	NS
1-14	That long range objectives be established to account for trends and changes that may affect clientele (e.g., population movement and economic conditions).	1.1617	NS
1-15	That provisions for a local chapter of DECA and activities be established to foster such activities as: social skills, leadership abilities, communications skills, etc.	.2501	NS
1-16	That provisions for advisory committee members, school personnel, and other people from the community give input to operation and evaluation of the program.	5.3105	NS

Table 14.--Continued.

Objective	Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
1-17 That curriculum offerings include career exploration at the elementary and junior high levels.	2.8874	NS
1-18 That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.	1.6779	NS
*****Chi-Square test statistic is illustrated in Appendix H, Table 27.		

Table 15.--Differences Between Professional Preparation and Respondents' Opinions on the Importance of Evaluative Criteria.

Evaluative Criteria		Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
2-1	Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.	1.2451	NS
2-2	Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation.	2.6035	NS
2-3	Instructional content is based on performance objectives.	3.5280	NS
2-4	Instructional activities, methods, and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.	.0612	NS
2-5	Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.	1.4967	NS
2-6	Guidance aspects--such as counseling--are provided by teacher coordinator, employers, and guidance counselor (e.g., students have a career objective).	5.4504	NS
2-7	Extra-class activities (such as DECA, school store) are provided.	.9427	NS
2-8	Adequate staff are provided in order that all responsibilities of the jobs are accomplished.	1.8412	NS
2-9	Home, business, and community relations are maintained on a continual basis.	2.0454	NS
2-10	Community resources such as physical size, economic base, natural resources, and tax base are taken into consideration.	.7233	NS

Table 15.--Continued.

	Evaluative Criteria	Chi Sq.	Sign. Level
2-11	Articulation--cooperation with other departments within school.	5.7378	NS
2-12	Library materials and facilities are provided on a centralized or decentralized basis.	.4428	NS
2-13	Qualifications and professional growth of teachers is maintained and updated to insure program quality.	.1693	NS
2-14	Supervisory practices/administration flexibility meet student needs.	1.6843	NS
2-15	Organization of program is effective in facilitating instruction progress and program objectives.	.0039	NS
2-16	Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station.	1.1250	NS
2-17	Labor market behavior--availability of jobs within community.	1.9556	NS
2-18	Student outcomes--job satisfaction (e.g., students obtain, hold, and advance in jobs related to field of preparation.	2.2040	NS
2-19	Philosophy and objectives of program are being met.	.7355	NS
2-20	Placement and follow-up of graduates are maintained on a continual basis.	2.4819	NS
2-21	Advisory committee functions and is used effectively.	5.1736	NS

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Evaluation will play a significant role in improving instruction and initiating appropriate change for educational problems in the future. At the same time, distributive education personnel are in continuous search of ways to improve programs for students preparing to enter new-found careers. By formulating clear and measurable objectives and setting standards for quality programs, distributive educators may initiate the essential steps in program evaluation.

The Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to develop program objectives and evaluative criteria for secondary distributive education programs in the State of Michigan. This study was undertaken to provide descriptive research in the area of evaluation that was not available.

Another purpose of the study was to provide distributive education personnel with a factual and an objective foundation for policy and practice based on the opinions of practitioners as well as experts in the field.

Thus, the problem in this study was to (1) develop and examine program objectives and evaluative criteria for distributive education program in the State of Michigan and

(2) determine and compare opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local vocational directors on the importance of selected program objectives and evaluative criteria.

Eighteen program objectives and 21 evaluative criteria were derived from a comprehensive literature review. The literature search consisted of studies by professional education organizations related to the development of criteria for distributive education programs, doctoral studies in distributive education that constructed criteria for the evaluation of ongoing programs, and criteria established for the evaluation of state and local vocational programs.

Research Procedures

The population of this study was 423 secondary distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local directors of vocational education programs under contract with the Michigan State Department of Education. Compiled lists of these populations were provided by the State Department of Education and the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education. A proportionate sample of 123 secondary distributive education programs was randomly selected from the list.

An opinionnaire was used to collect the data for this descriptive study. The survey instrument required respondents to (1) rate objectives and criteria on a scale from one to six, and (2) rank the five most important objectives

and criteria relative to their programs. Part I of the survey was designed to elicit what objectives respondents believed to be most important to their programs. Part II was based on evaluative criteria and respondents were asked to rate their importance in respect to program objectives. The rating scale used for both objectives and criteria was 1 - "Extremely Important," 2 - "Very Important," 3 - "Fairly Important," 4 - "Important," 5 - "Somewhat Important," and 6 - "No Importance."

Findings

The data presented in this study were compiled from the responses of distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local vocational directors (65 percent response) who returned the opinionnaire sent to his/her respective institution.

A summary of findings related to the specific research questions for this study is as follows:

1. What objectives are most important in considering the success of a distributive education program as determined by distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local vocational directors?

The five most important program objectives in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local vocational directors were as follows:

2. Do the objectives adequately encompass a secondary distributive education program. Substantial agreement

Overall Rank		Objective
1	1-1	That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education Program.
2	1-12	That Distributive Education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural background.
3	1-5	That the Distributive Education Program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen distributive occupational field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society. (Career and job potential.)
4	1-18	That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.
5	1-4	That the Distributive Education Program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.

existed between distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local vocational education directors. When asked to recommend additions to the list, respondents suggested few tasks that were not already included in the current listing or offered a variation similar to those mentioned.

3. To what extent do distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local vocational directors agree on the same objectives?

For the most part, distributive education teachers, teacher coordinators, and local vocational directors agree on the same objectives. However, using the mean average, distributive education coordinators believe that objective 1-18 "Students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work" is more important than do administrators and teachers. Whereas, local vocational administrators on the average, agree objective 1-12 "To serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds" to be more important than teachers and teacher-coordinators.

4. What evaluative criteria are most important in considering the success of distributive education programs as determined by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors.

The five most important evaluative criteria in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors were as follows:

Overall Rank	Evaluative Criteria	
1	2-2	Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation.
2	2-1	Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.
3	2-16	Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station.
4	2-5	Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.
5	2-4	Instructional activities, methods and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.

5. Do the evaluative criteria adequately encompass a secondary distributive education program?

The evaluative criteria appear to adequately encompass a secondary distributive education program. Substantial agreement existed between distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors. When asked to recommend additions to the list, respondents suggested few tasks that were not already included in the current listing or offered a variation similar to those mentioned.

6. To what extent do distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors agree upon the evaluative criteria for a distributive education program?

In general, distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors agree on the same evaluative criteria. However, there is a disagreement on Criteria 2-7 "Extra class activities such as DECA and school store" are on the mean average rated more important by administrators and teachers as compared to teacher-coordinators. Also, on the average, distributive education teachers rate evaluative criteria "Labor market behavior and importance of advisory committees" lower than teacher-coordinators and administrators.

7. Do years of experience make a difference in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors?

For the most part, years of experience do not make a difference in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors.

8. Does the amount of professional preparation make a difference in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors?

For the most part, professional preparation does not make a difference in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors.

A summary of findings relating to the testing of the null hypothesis using the chi-square test statistic (.05 level of significance) is as follows:

H_{01} There are no significant differences between the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors regarding appropriate objectives and their relative importance among three basic types of programs.

A significant difference between type of program offered and the respondents' opinions on the importance of program objectives was found on Objective 1-9:

That the distributive education program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by the societal, economic, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes.

There are differences in opinion among respondents in three types of programs on this objective. Thus, practitioners in the field do not totally support this statement.

Ho₂ There are no significant differences between the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors regarding appropriate evaluative criteria and the relative importance of each evaluative criteria between basic types of programs.

Significant differences between type of program offered and position existed in the respondents' opinions on the importance of evaluative criteria were found such as criteria:

Program 2-7 Extra-Class activities such as DECA and school store are provided.

There are differences in opinion among respondents in three types of programs regarding this criterion. Thus, practitioners in the field do not totally support this statement.

Program 2-9 Home, business, and community relations are maintained on a continual basis.

There are differences in opinion among respondents in three types of programs regarding this criterion. Therefore, practitioners in the field do not totally support this statement.

Position 2-7 Extra-class activities such as DECA and school store are provided.

There are differences in opinion among respondents by position regarding this criterion. Therefore, practitioners as a group do not totally support this statement.

Ho₃ There are no significant differences between personnel in various sizes of schools regarding objectives and evaluative criteria between the two basic types of programs.

This can be supported by the data since no significant differences were found between sizes of schools in the opinions of distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors. Respondents from the three groups agreed on the relative importance of program objectives and evaluative criteria.

Ho₄ There are no significant differences of opinions between teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational directors relative to years of experience.

A significant difference between years of experience and the respondents' opinions on program objectives was found on Objective 1-1:

That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the distributive education program.

There are differences in opinions among respondents relative to years of experience on this objective. Though there are an overwhelming number of people that agree the objective is important, the feeling is not unanimous.

Ho₅ There are no significant differences of opinion between teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors, relative to the degree of professional preparation.

A significant difference in the respondents' opinions on the importance of the following objective was found on Objective 1-12:

That distributive education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.

There are differences in opinion among respondents relative to professional preparation, therefore, as professional preparation increases, so does the importance of serving students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were made:

1. Type of program such as cooperative, project, and a combination of both types, offered has little effect on the opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors regarding program of objectives.
2. Type of program such as cooperative, project, and a combination of both types offered has little or no effect on the opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors regarding evaluative criteria.
3. Enrollment of size of school has no effect between opinions of respondents on objectives and evaluative criteria for three basic types of programs.

4. Years of experience in the present position has little or no effect on the opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors relative to program objectives and evaluative criteria.
5. Degree of professional preparation has little or no effect on the opinions expressed by distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors relative to program objectives and evaluative criteria.

Implications and Concluding Statement

All individuals who participate in the delivery of educational programs should be involved in the evaluative process. Activities for the evaluation of programs will often include such components as (1) establishing program objectives, (2) determining evaluative criteria, and (3) deciding what standards are appropriate for measuring objectives and criteria (e.g., follow-up survey, external evaluations, placement).

Furthermore, as outlined in Chapter I, evaluation should be based on the needs and goals of the respective local school district or agency. In the past, there has been disagreement on which objectives and criteria are appropriate for various types of schools and programs offered. From this study, it is important to note that practitioners differ with the "experts" such as state department personnel and teacher educators as to the

importance of furthering education for vocational students. If this is a prevailing feeling, it signifies a dramatic change from the past for vocational training. If a new goal for distributive education is to prepare for college training, distributive education personnel must be cautious not to allow "elitism" to take over. Moreover, practitioners have indicated their program evaluation should not include criteria such as a DECA club, school store, and public relations efforts, which are aspects to be considered in a quality program according to various authorities.

However, a further observation may reveal that differences are not that large or widespread. After all, despite any differences, educators should not lose sight that their main priority is to serve students and employers in the best possible way.

The objectives and criteria set forth in the present study can serve as a basis for evaluation of distributive education programs in Michigan. Local school personnel may use the program objectives and evaluative criteria in their present form, or better yet, in more measurable terms.

Numerous studies in the area of evaluation have made important contributions for local self-evaluations. Although, little has been done in validating specific objectives to evaluative criteria by practitioners on a local or statewide basis such as this study purported to do.

Lastly, as standards are developed, it is important that the primary purpose for all involved in evaluation, is

to identify strengths and weaknesses for program development and revision. In no way should such observations be used to punish or coerce those involved in the delivery of the educational program.

In summary, local practitioners will be provided with data that has been considered the most current and "best thoughts, practices and conditions" for distributive education programs across the nation. Distributive education personnel must constantly review program objectives and evaluative criteria because of changing educational and student needs.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made:

1. That distributive education teachers, teacher-coordinators, and local vocational education directors in the State of Michigan use the findings in this study to develop comprehensive self-evaluation instruments suitable to their local distributive education programs.
2. That personnel in the Michigan State Department of Education seriously consider and use the findings in this study in their efforts to develop statewide self-evaluation instruments for local distributive education programs.
3. That research based on the data available in this study be replicated in other states and/or on a

national basis using various other groups such as employers, students, and state and local legislators.

4. That research be conducted to determine what standards (tests, evaluation groups, etc.) would be acceptable to measure to what degree objectives and evaluative criteria are being met.
5. That further research be conducted of an alternative nature (aside from ranking) such as paired comparison methodology to establish evaluative criterion weights which reflect the priorities expressed by various interest groups.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

The Lucy C. Crawford study (1967) constructed eleven goals of Distributive Education. These goals are as follows:

1. That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education program.
2. That the Distributive Education program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise system as a cornerstone of the American Democracy.
3. That the Distributive Education program should foster an awareness of the civic, social, and moral responsibilities of business to society.
4. That the Distributive Education program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.
5. That the Distributive Education program should stimulate interest in his chosen distributive occupation field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society.
6. That the Distributive Education program should prepare distributive personnel to analyze consumer demand and to satisfy the needs and wants of consumers intelligently, efficiently, and pleasantly.
7. That the Distributive Education program should provide training that results in increased efficiency in distribution and marketing.
8. That the Distributive Education program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.

9. That the Distributive Education program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by societal, economic, technical, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes.
10. That the Distributive Education program should advance the objectives of the total educational program.
11. That the Distributive Education program should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN SAMPLE

LARGE SIZE (CLASS A)*

Adams High School Rochester, MI 48063	Flint Kearsley High School Flint, MI
Andover (Bloomfield) High School Bloomfield Hills, MI 48103	Fraser High School Fraser, MI 48026
Battle Creek Central High School Battle Creek, MI 48107	Garden City West High School Garden City, MI 48135
Bentley High School Livonia, MI 48154	Grandhaven High School Grandhaven, MI 49417
Brighton High School Brighton, MI 48116	Grosse Pointe High School Grosse Pointe, MI
Cass Technical High School Detroit, MI 48201	Henry Ford High School Detroit, MI 48219
Cody High School Detroit, MI 48228	Holland High School Holland, MI 49423
Denby High School Detroit, MI 48228	Huron High School Ann Arbor, MI 48105
Dondero High School Royal Oak, MI 48067	Lakeshore High School St. Clair Shores, MI
East Kentwood High School Kentwood, MI 48508	Lamphere High School Madison, MI
East Lansing High School East Lansing, MI 48823	Lanse Creuse North High School Mt. Clemens, MI 48045
Ferndale High School Ferndale, MI 48220	Lincoln Park High School Lincoln Park, MI 48146
Fitzgerald High School Warren, MI 48091	

*Large Class A -- 1,430 or more students

Mona Shores High School
Muskegon, MI

North Farmington High School
Farmington Hills, MI 48018

Owosso High School
Owosso, MI 48867

Pontiac Central High School
Pontiac, MI 48053

Redford Union High School
Redford, MI 48240

Roosevelt High School
Wyandotte, MI 48192

Sault Area Skill Center
Sault Ste. Marie, MI

Seaholm High School
Birmingham, MI 48009

Tower High School
Warren, MI 48093

Walled Lake Central High School
Walled Lake, MI 48088

Waterford Mott High School
Pontiac, MI.

PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN SAMPLE

MEDIUM SIZE (CLASS B)*

Ainsworth High School
Flint, MI 48507

South Haven High School
South Haven, MI 49090

Allegan High School
Allegan, MI 49010

Sturgis High School
Sturgis, MI 49091

Alma High School
Alma, MI 48801

Troy High School
Troy, MI 48084

Beecher High School
Flint, MI 48505

Clawson High School
Clawson, MI 48017

Comstock High School
Comstock, MI 49041

Gaylord High School
Gaylord, MI 49735

Greenville High School
Greenville, MI 48838

Hartland High School
Hartland, MI 48029

Jenison High School
Jenison, MI 49428

Lake Fenton High School
Fenton, MI 48430

Menominee High School
Menominee, MI 49858

Mt. Morris Johnson Memorial High School
Mt. Morris, MI 48458

Ovid Elsie High School
Elsie, MI 48831

Paw Paw High School
Paw Paw, MI 49079

*Medium Class B -- 708 - 1,429 students

PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN SAMPLE

SMALL SIZE (CLASS C-D)*

Atherton High School
Burton, MI 48319

Mattawan High School
Mattawan, MI 49071

Bad Axe High School
Bad Axe, MI

Negaunee High School
Negaunee, MI 49866

Bedford High School
Temperance, MI 48182

Ontonagon High School
Ontonagon, MI 49953

Benzie Central High School
Benzonia, MI 49616

Perry High School
Perry, MI 48872

Buchanan High School
Buchanan, MI 49107

Ravenna High School
Ravenna, MI 49451

Carlson High School
Rockwood, MI 48173

Rogers City High School
Rogers City, MI 49779

Charlevoix High School
Charlevoix, MI 49720

Saugatuck High School
Saugatuck, MI 49453

Colon High School
Colon, MI 49040

Union Dowagiac High School
Dowagiac, MI

Forest Hills Northern High School
Grand Rapids, MI 49506

Woodhaven High School
Flat Rock, MI 48134

Goodrich High School
Goodrich, MI 48434

Haslett High School
Haslett, MI 48840

Huron High School
New Boston, MI 48164

Ishpeming High School
Ishpeming, MI 49849

Laingsburg Community High School
Laingsburg, MI 48848

Lakeville High School
Otisville, MI 48463

*Small -- less than 707 students

SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS

INCLUDED IN SAMPLE

Ann Arbor Public Schools Ann Arbor, MI 48103	Muskegon Public Schools Muskegon, MI 49440
Berrien Springs School District Berrien Springs, MI 49103	Petoskey Public Schools Petoskey, MI 49770
Birch Run Area Schools Birch Run, MI 48413	Saginaw Public Schools Saginaw, MI 48063
Bloomfield Hills School District Bloomfield Hills, MI 48013	Saginaw Township Community Schools Saginaw, MI 48063
Corunna Public Schools Corunna, MI 48817	Sault Area High School and Skill Center Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783
Dearborn Public Schools Dearborn, MI 48126	Southfield Public Schools Southfield, MI 48075
Genesee Intermediate School District Flint, MI 48507	Tech Center Benton Harbor, MI 49022
Hazel Park City School District Hazel Park, MI 48030	Troy Senior High School Troy, MI 48084
Huron Valley Schools Milford, MI 48042	Waterford Township School District Waterford, MI 48095
Inkster Public Schools Inkster, MI 48141	Wayne Intermediate School District Wayne, MI 48184
Kearsley Community Schools Flint, MI 48506	
Lake Shore Public Schools St. Clair Shores, MI 48082	
Madison District Public Schools Madison Heights, MI 48071	
Midland Public Schools Midland, MI 48640	
Mt. Pleasant Public Schools Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858	

SKILL CENTERS

Bay-Arneal Skill Center
Bay City, MI 48706

Southeast Oakland Vocational Center
Royal Oak, MI 48073

Benton Harbor Skill Center
Benton Harbor, MI

Van Buren Skill Center
Lawrence, MI 49064

Branch Area Skill Center
Coldwater, MI 49039

Wexford-Missaukee Vocational Center
Cadillac, MI 49601

Capital Area Career Center
Mason, MI 48854

Career Opportunities Center
Saginaw, MI 48602

Career Technical Center
Ypsilanti, MI 48197

Dickinson Area Vocational Center
Kingsford, MI 49801

Jackson Area Career Center
Jackson, MI 49201

Jackson Area Skill Center
Jackson, MI 49201

Kent Skill Center
Grand Rapids, MI 49506

Lapeer County Vocational Center
Attica, MI 49412

Lenawee Skill Center
Adrian, MI 49221

Newaygo Area Vocational Center
Fremont, MI 49412

Northwest Oakland Vocational Center
Clarkston, MI 48016

Petoskey Area Vocational Center
Petoskey, MI 49770

Sault Area Vocational Center
Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

SURVEY OF DE PERSONNEL AND LOCAL VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS
TO DETERMINE THE IMPORTANCE OF OBJECTIVES AND
EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR DE PROGRAMS

General Information

Name _____
(Please print)

Position _____

PLEASE CHECK:

Sex: Male _____ Female _____

Age: 24 or under _____ 25-34 _____ 35-44 _____ 45-54 _____ 55 or older _____

Type Program Offered:

Which of the three types of DE programs best approximates what
you offer:

Cooperative _____ Project Lab (Block-Time) _____ Both _____

COOPERATIVE METHOD--A minimum fifteen hours paid on the job
experience related to classroom instruction and each student's
occupational objective as contracted with the Michigan
Department of Education.

PROJECT METHOD--Instruction which involves a series of group
and/or individually designed learning activities and projects
related to each student's occupational objective as contracted
with the Michigan Department of Education.

CO-OP METHOD/PROJECT METHOD--A combination of the co-operative
education technique and project method as contracted with the
Michigan Department of Education.

Level of Education:

Baccalaureate _____ Masters _____ Specialist _____ Doctorate _____

Years of experience at present position:

1 - 3 _____ 4 - 8 _____ 9 - 12 _____ Over 12 _____

Level of Certification:

Annual _____ Temporary _____ Full _____

INTRODUCTION: Following are objectives and evaluative criteria for DE programs as have been determined by "experts" in the field. To enhance the relevance in evaluation of DE programs in Michigan you are asked to help decide which objectives and criteria are most important to your program.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please take the following steps in filling out the opinionnaire:

1. Read Part I (The Objectives) and Part II (The Criteria) and circle one of the numbers to the right of each item relative to its importance for your program.

The key for this purpose is as follows:

- 1 - Extremely important
- 2 - Very important
- 3 - Fairly important
- 4 - Important
- 5 - Somewhat important
- 6 - No importance

2. After you have completed the rating scale, please rank what you consider to be the five most important objectives and criteria.
3. Should you wish to suggest additional objectives or criteria, please list them at the end of the section to which they are related and circle one value as indicated above.
4. Return the opinionnaire in the enclosed envelope. Copies of the study will be provided to your state association MADET and SACVE.

Thank you for your cooperation.

PART I: The following is a list of objectives for a Distributive Education program. A number of them were derived from the (1967) Lucy Crawford Study. Using the scale cited above, please indicate your opinion regarding the importance of each objective.

Distributive Education Objectives

- 1-1 That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education program.

Extremely imp.
Very Imp.
Fairly imp.
Important
Somewhat imp.
No importance

1 2 3 4 5 6

		Extremely imp.	Very imp.	Fairly imp.	Important	Somewhat imp.	No importance
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1-2	That the Distributive Education program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise system as a cornerstone of the American Democracy.						
1-3	That the Distributive Education program should foster an awareness of the civic, social, and moral responsibilities of business to society.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-4	That the Distributive Education program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-5	That the Distributive Education program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen distributive occupational field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society. (Career and job potential)	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-6	That the Distributive Education program should prepare distributive personnel to analyze consumer demand and to satisfy the needs and wants of consumers intelligently, efficiently, and pleasantly.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-7	That the Distributive Education program should provide training that results in increased efficiency in distribution and marketing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-8	That the Distributive Education program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-9	That the Distributive Education program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by societal, economic, technical, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-10	That the Distributive Education program should advance the objectives of the total educational program.	1	2	3	4	5	6

		Extremely imp.	Very imp.	Fairly imp.	Important	Somewhat imp.	No importance
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1-11	That the Distributive Education program should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.						
1-12	That Distributive Education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-13	That educational needs of adults in the local community should be served.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-14	That long range objectives be established to account for trends and changes that may affect clientele (e.g., population movement and economic conditions).	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-15	That provisions for a local chapter of DECA and activities be established to foster such activities as: social skills, leadership abilities, communication skills, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-16	That provision for advisory committee members, school personnel, and other people from the community give input to operation and evaluation of the program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-17	That curriculum offerings include career exploration at the elementary and junior high levels.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-18	That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-19	_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-20	_____	1	2	3	4	5	6

Referring again to the previous list of objectives, please choose those five that you feel are most crucial to the success of a DE program. Rank order 1 through 5 beginning with the most important.

- 1 _____
- 2 _____
- 3 _____
- 4 _____
- 5 _____

PART II: The following is a list of evaluative criteria for a Distributive Education program. To assist you in the understanding of criteria in completing the opinionnaire, evaluative criteria will be defined as: important aspects of a program which are used as guides for attainment of program objectives.

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

		<i>Extremely imp.</i>	<i>Very imp.</i>	<i>Fairly imp.</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Somewhat imp.</i>	<i>No importance</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6
2-1	Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-2	Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-3	Instructional content is based on performance objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-4	Instructional activities, methods and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-5	Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-6	Guidance aspects--such as counseling--are provided by teacher coordinator, employers, and guidance counselors (e.g., students have a career objective).	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-7	Extra-class activities (such as DECA, school store) are provided.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-8	Adequate staff are provided in order that all responsibilities of the job are accomplished.	1	2	3	4	5	6

		<i>Extremely imp.</i>	<i>Very imp.</i>	<i>Fairly imp.</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Somewhat imp.</i>	<i>No importance</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6
2-9	Home, business and community relations are maintained on a continual basis.						
2-10	Community resources such as physical size, economic base, natural resources and tax base are taken into consideration.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-11	Articulation--cooperation with other departments within school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-12	Library materials and facilities are provided on a centralized or decentralized basis.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-13	Qualifications and professional growth of teachers in maintained and updated to insure program quality.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-14	Supervisory practices/administration flexibility meet student needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-15	Organization of program is effective in facilitating instructional progress and program objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-16	Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-17	Labor market behavior--availability of jobs within community.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-18	Student outcomes--job satisfaction (e.g., students obtain, hold, and advance in jobs related to field of preparation).	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-19	Philosophy and objectives of program are being met.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-20	Placement and follow-up of graduates are maintained on a continual basis.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2-21	Advisory committee functions and is used effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	6

2-22	_____	1	2	3	4	5	6			
2-23	_____	1	2	3	4	5	6			

Referring again to the previous list of criteria, please choose those five that you feel are most crucial to the success of a DE program. Rank order 1 through 5 beginning with the most important.

1	_____
2	_____
3	_____
4	_____
5	_____

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

Letter to Teacher Educators and State Supervisor of DE

Date

Name
Title
School
Address
City, State ZIP Code

Dear :

Presently, at Michigan State University a study is being conducted to determine basic beliefs or objectives and evaluative criteria for all secondary Distributive Education programs under contract with the Michigan State Department of Education.

It is felt that in this era of evaluation and accountability it is necessary to distinguish the effective from the ineffective educational strategy.

By establishing which objectives and criteria are most important for Michigan Distributive Education programs on the secondary level, a sound basis is provided for evaluation.

Your participation would be appreciated and of value to DE programs in Michigan. Please take the following steps in the examination of this material.

1. Review the objectives and criteria for DE programs and acknowledge your consent or disagreement.
2. Should you wish to suggest additional objectives or criteria, please list them at the end of the section.
3. Make any general observations, suggestions, or criticisms on the last page.
4. Enclose the objectives and criteria list in the stamped envelope and return by September 15.

Respectfully yours,

Michael W. Little

Letter to DE Personnel and Local
Administrators

Dear Colleague:

I have been a former DE teacher-coordinator for the past four years in Midland Public Schools. Most recently, I have been studying for a full year on a doctoral fellowship in the area of distributive teacher education at Michigan State University.

Developing a quality DE program has always been a major concern to distributive educators. Furthermore, Distributive Education personnel are in constant search of ways to improve programs for students preparing to enter distributive occupations. Evaluation can play a significant role in improving instruction and initiating appropriate change for educational programs.

State and federal guidelines are emphasizing greater importance on the evaluation of vocational education programs. DE teachers and teacher-coordinators ought to take a serious look at their role in the evaluation of their programs or others will. You can provide a major contribution in this regard.

The present study is endorsed by the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education and the Michigan Association of Distributive Education Teachers. On the following pages are objectives and evaluative criteria for DE programs. Both areas provide a basis for the evaluation of a program. Would you please take the time to fill out the opinionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Michael W. Little

March 8, 1978

Dear Colleague:

In the beginning part of February, you received an opinionnaire concerning the evaluation of Distributive Education programs. I realize with your busy schedule the survey may have been overlooked.

Enclosed is another copy of the opinionnaire for your completion and a stamped self-addressed envelope for your submission.

Will you please take a little of your time to fill out the survey instrument. Listed are objectives and criteria considered important in the evaluation of Distributive Education programs. Rate those objectives and criteria that you believe to be most important if your program were being evaluated.

Your immediate attention and cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Michael W. Little
Distributive Education Teacher Educator
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Enclosures

APPENDIX E

Table 16.--Total Responses for Degree of Importance Attached to Program Objectives.

Objectives	Number and Percent of Total Responses											
	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important		Important		Somewhat Important		No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. That preparation for gainful employment . . .	45	57.0	27	34.2	5	6.3	2	2.5				
2. That the Distributive Education Program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise . . .	15	19.0	29	36.7	19	24.1	12	15.2	4	5.1		
3. That the Distributive Education Program should foster an awareness of civic, social, and moral . . .	15	19.0	27	34.2	23	29.1	10	12.7	4	5.1		
4. That the Distributive Education Program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards . . .	30	38.0	31	39.2	10	12.7	6	7.6	2	2.5		
5. That the Distributive Education Program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen Distributive Occupational field . . .	33	41.8	33	41.8	10	12.7	2	2.5	1	1.3		
6. That the Distributive Education Program prepare the Distributive personnel to analyze consumer demand and satisfy the needs and wants of consumers . . .	15	19.0	32	40.5	15	19.0	7	8.9	10	12.7		
7. That the Distributive Education Program provide training that results in increased efficiency in distribution and marketing.	26	32.9	22	27.8	18	22.8	7	8.9	6	7.6		
8. That the Distributive Education Program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.	12	15.2	28	35.4	17	21.5	14	17.7	6	7.6	2	2.5

Table 16.--Continued.

Objectives	Number and Percent of Total Responses											
	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important		Important		Somewhat Important		No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
9. That the Distributive Education Program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they . . .	19	24.1	30	38.0	16	20.3	11	13.9	3	3.8		
10. That the Distributive Education Program should advance objectives of total educational programs.	18	22.8	32	40.5	21	26.6	6	7.6	2	2.5		
11. That the Distributive Education Program should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.	15	19.0	30	38.0	24	30.4	6	7.6	3	3.8	1	1.3
12. That the Distributive Education Program should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	32	40.5	26	32.9	13	16.5	5	6.3	2	2.5	1	1.3
13. That the needs of adults in the local community should be served.	5	6.3	24	30.4	17	21.5	9	11.4	21	26.6	3	3.8
14. That long range objectives be established to account for trends and changes.	4	5.1	20	25.3	24	30.4	15	19	11	13.9	5	6.3
15. That provisions for a local chapter of DECA and activities be established . . .	9	11.4	19	24.1	13	16.5	10	12.7	20	25.3	8	10.1
16. That provisions for advisory committee members school personnel . . .	18	22.8	27	34.2	20	25.3	7	8.9	6	7.6	1	1.3

Table 16.--Continued.

Objectives	Number and Percent of Total Responses											
	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important		Important		Somewhat Important		No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
17. That curriculum offering include career exploration at the elementary and junior high levels.	21	26.6	14	17.7	25	31.6	9	11.4	10	12.7		
18. That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work.	28	35.4	34	43	14	17.7	3	3.8				

Table 17.--Total Responses Attached to Degree of Importance for Evaluative Criteria.

Evaluation Criteria	Number and Percent of Total Responses											
	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important		Important		Somewhat Important		No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Physical facilities and equipment . . .	30	38	33	41.8	11	13.9	5	6.3				
2. Curriculum is directly related . . .	30	38	29	36.7	11	13.9	4	5.1	4	5.1	1	1.3
3. Instructional content is based on . . .	18	22.8	33	41.8	12	15.2	9	11.4	6	7.6	1	1.3
4. Instructional activities, methods and procedures . . .	32	40.5	25	31.6	14	17.7	6	7.6	2	2.5		
5. Instructional materials are current . . .	35	44.3	27	34.2	14	17.7	3	3.8				
6. Guidance aspects--such as counseling . . .	30	30.8	37	46.8	6	7.6	4	5.1	2	2.5		
7. Extra-class activities . . .	14	17.7	22	27.8	16	20.3	7	8.9	14	17.7	6	7.6
8. Adequate staff are provided in order that . . .	31	39.2	27	34.2	11	13.9	7	8.9	2	2.5	1	1.3
9. Home, business, and community relations . . .	14	17.7	28	35.4	20	25.3	13	16.5	4	5.1		
10. Community resources such as physical size, economic base . . .	9	11.4	26	32.9	22	27.8	12	15.2	7	8.9	3	3.8
11. Articulation-cooperation with other departments . . .	13	16.5	28	35.4	20	25.3	14	17.7	3	3.8	1	1.3
12. Library materials and facilities are provided . . .	10	12.7	20	25.3	26	32.9	11	13.9	8	10.1	4	5.1
13. Qualifications and professional growth of . . .	25	31.6	39	49.4	7	8.9	7	8.9	1	1.3		

Table 17.--Continued.

Evaluation Criteria	Number and Percent of Total Responses											
	Extremely Important		Very Important		Fairly Important		Important		Somewhat Important		No Importance	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
14. Supervisory practices/administration flexibility . . .	21	26.6	37	46.8	13	16.5	6	7.6	2	2.5		
15. Organization or program is effective . . .	23	29.1	30	38.0	19	24.1	6	7.6	1	1.3		
16. Students work experience--the best possible placement . . .	45	57.0	25	31.6	9	11.4						
17. Labor Market behavior . . .	29	36.7	23	29.1	18	22.8	6	7.6	2	2.5	1	1.3
18. Student outcomes--job satisfaction . . .	22	27.8	38	48.1	14	17.7	4	5.1	1	1.3		
19. Philosophy and objectives of program are being met . . .	22	27.8	33	41.8	13	16.5	7	8.9	4	5.1		
20. Placement and follow-up of graduates . . .	20	25.3	30	38.0	14	17.7	4	5.1	10	12.7	1	1.3
21. Advisory Committee functions . . .	17	21.5	20	24.3	20	25.3	14	17.7	6	7.6	2	2.5

APPENDIX F

Table 18.--Means and Standard Deviations for Local Vocational Education Administrators, DE Teacher Coordinators, and Teachers Regarding Program Objectives.

Objectives	Administrators A Group 1	Coordinators C Group 2	Teachers T Group 3	Within Group Total
	Mean SD	Mean SD	Mean SD	Mean SD
1. That preparation for gainful employment . . .	1.6667 0.8876	1.6047 0.7910	1.3750 0.4945	1.5443 0.7306
2. That the Distributive Education Program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise . . .	2.1667 0.9374	2.5116 1.1827	2.6667 1.0901	2.5063 1.1224
3. That the Distributive Education Program should foster an awareness of civic, social, and moral . . .	2.2500 0.6216	2.5814 1.2953	2.2500 0.8847	2.5063 1.1045
4. That the Distributive Education Program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards . . .	1.7500 0.7538	2.1163 1.0956	1.8333 1.0072	1.9747 1.0260
5. That the Distributive Education Program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen Distributive Occupational field . . .	1.8333 0.8348	1.8140 0.9821	1.7500 0.6079	1.7975 0.8636
6. That the Distributive Education Program prepare the Distributive personnel to analyze consumer demand and satisfy the needs and wants of consumers . . .	3.0000 1.2792	2.6512 1.3431	2.1667 1.0072	2.5570 1.2413
7. That the Distributive Education Program provide training that results in increased efficiency in distribution and marketing.	2.8333 1.5859	2.3256 1.2672	2.0000 0.8847	2.3038 1.2199
8. That the Distributive Education Program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.	2.8333 1.4035	2.8372 1.3439	2.5417 1.1025	2.7468 1.2850
9. That the Distributive Education Program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they . . .	2.1667 1.0299	2.3488 1.1728	2.4853 1.0624	2.3544 1.1203

Table 18.--Continued.

Objectives	Administrators A Group 1	Coordinators C Group 2	Teachers T Group 3	Within Group Total
	Mean SD	Mean SD	Mean SD	Mean SD
10. That the Distributive Education Program should advance objectives of total educational programs.	2.0883 0.6686	2.3023 1.2254	2.3750 0.9237	2.2911 1.0737
11. That the Distributive Education Program should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.	2.6667 1.2309	2.4651 1.1619	2.2500 0.8470	2.4304 1.0874
12. That the Distributive Education Program should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	1.7500 0.7538	2.0465 1.2141	2.0833 1.1389	2.0127 1.1355
13. That the needs of adults in the local community should be served.	3.0833 1.3790	3.6279 1.4313	2.9167 1.3160	3.3291 1.3898
14. That long range objectives be established to account for trends and changes.	3.0833 0.9003	3.3488 1.4290	3.3333 1.2740	3.3085 1.3180
15. That provisions for a local chapter of DECA and activities be established . . .	2.6667 1.0731	3.9535 1.5729	3.0000 1.6151	3.4684 1.5242
16. That provisions for advisory committee members, school personnel . . .	2.0000 0.6030	2.4651 1.3513	2.7500 1.1887	2.4810 1.2204
17. That curriculum offering include career exploration at the elementary and junior high levels.	2.5833 1.1645	2.6512 1.4123	2.7083 1.3015	2.6582 1.3458
18. That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work.	1.9167 0.6686	1.7442 0.8192	2.1667 0.8681	1.8987 0.8146

Table 19.--Means and Standard Deviations for Local Vocational Education Administrators, DE Teacher-Coordiators, and Teachers Regarding Evaluative Criteria.

Evaluative Criteria	Group 1 Mean SD	Group 2 Mean SD	Group 3 Mean SD	Group 4 Mean SD
1. Physical facilities and criteria . . .	1.9167 0.6686	1.8605 0.9407	1.9167 0.8805	1.8861 0.8879
2. Curriculum is directly related . . .	1.5833 0.7930	2.0930 1.1300	2.2500 1.3910	2.0633 1.1757
3. Instructional content is based on . . .	2.0000 1.2060	2.3256 1.2858	2.8333 1.1293	2.4304 1.2289
4. Instructional activities, methods, and procedures . . .	2.0000 0.7385	1.8605 1.1251	2.2500 1.0734	2.0000 1.0617
5. Instructional materials are current . . .	1.6667 0.7785	1.7674 0.9216	1.9853 0.8065	1.8101 0.8603
6. Guidance aspects--such as counseling . . .	1.9167 0.9603	1.6744 0.8373	2.2083 1.0624	1.8734 0.9199
7. Extra-class activities . . .	2.5833 0.9962	3.4419 1.6228	2.5417 1.5874	3.0380 1.5367
8. Adequate staff are provided in order that . . .	2.2500 0.9653	2.0930 1.3419	1.8750 0.8502	2.0506 1.1613
9. Home, business, and community relations . . .	2.3333 0.7785	2.6047 1.2562	2.5833 1.0180	2.5570 1.1285
10. Community resources such as physical size, economic base . . .	2.6667 0.6513	2.8837 1.5616	3.0000 0.9325	2.8861 1.2931
11. Articulation-cooperation with other departments . . .	2.0833 0.9003	2.7442 1.2742	2.6250 0.9696	2.6076 1.1398
12. Library materials and facilities provided . . .	3.0000 0.8528	3.0000 1.5119	2.9583 1.2329	2.9873 1.3522

Table 19.--Continued.

Evaluative Criteria	Group 1 Mean SD	Group 2 Mean SD	Group 3 Mean SD	Group 4 Mean SD
13. Qualifications and professional growth of . . .	<u>1.8333</u> 1.1146	<u>1.9302</u> 1.0094	<u>2.1667</u> 0.7020	<u>1.9873</u> 0.9444
14. Supervisory practices/administration flexibility . . .	<u>2.1667</u> 0.7177	<u>2.1860</u> 1.1182	<u>2.0000</u> 0.8341	<u>2.1266</u> 0.9879
15. Organization or program is effective . . .	<u>2.0000</u> 1.1282	<u>2.0930</u> 0.9465	<u>2.2917</u> 0.9546	<u>2.1392</u> 0.9773
16. Students work experience--the best possible placement . . .	<u>1.6667</u> 0.6513	<u>1.4186</u> 0.6631	<u>1.7083</u> 0.7506	<u>1.5443</u> 0.6891
17. Labor market behavior . . .	<u>2.0000</u> 0.8528	<u>1.9767</u> 1.2245	<u>2.5000</u> 1.1034	<u>2.1392</u> 1.1412
18. Student outcomes--job satisfaction . . .	<u>2.1667</u> 0.9374	<u>1.8837</u> 0.8786	<u>2.2500</u> 0.8470	<u>2.0380</u> 0.8780
19. Philosophy and objectives of program are being met . . .	<u>2.1667</u> 1.2673	<u>2.1163</u> 1.1794	<u>2.4167</u> 0.8805	<u>2.2152</u> 1.1117
20. Placement and follow-up of graduates . . .	<u>2.0833</u> 0.5149	<u>2.5349</u> 1.5330	<u>2.5000</u> 1.2511	<u>2.4557</u> 1.3456
21. Advisory Committee functions . . .	<u>2.0833</u> 1.1645	<u>2.6744</u> 1.3925	<u>3.1250</u> 1.1910	<u>2.7215</u> 1.3027

APPENDIX G

Table 20.--Ranking for Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-Coordination, and Local Vocational Education Administrators of Program Objectives.

Overall Rank		Objective	Weighted Arithmetic Scale
1	1-1	That preparation for gainful employment and for advancement in a distributive occupation is the primary goal of the Distributive Education Program.	265
2	1-12	That Distributive Education should serve students of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and cultural backgrounds.	136
3	1-5	That the Distributive Education program should stimulate the student's interest in his chosen distributive occupational field by providing an understanding of the opportunities it offers him to be a contributing member of society. (Career and job potential.)	134
4	1-18	That students are encouraged to improve their competencies by further education and work so that they can progress beyond entry level positions.	80
5	1-4	That the Distributive Education program should encourage and promote the use of ethical standards in business and industry.	77
6	1-2	That the Distributive Education Program should engender an understanding and appreciation of the American private enterprise system as a cornerstone of the American Democracy.	64
7	1-7	That the Distributive Education Program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.	60*
8	1-3	That the Distributive Education Program should foster an awareness of the civic, social, and moral responsibilities of business and industry.	55
9	1-17	That curriculum offerings include career exploration at the elementary and junior high levels.	53
10	1-10	That the Distributive Education program should advance the objectives of the total educational program.	49

*Respondents were asked to rate the five most important objectives on a scale of 1-5. A weighted value of 5 was given to each objective ranked 1 in importance. A value of 4 was given to each objective ranked 2 in importance and so on, with a value of one given to the objective ranked 5 in importance.

Table 20.--Continued.

Overall Rank		Objective	Weighted Arithmetic Scale
11	1-6	That the Distributive Education program should prepare distributive personnel to analyze consumer demand and to satisfy the needs and wants of consumers intelligently, efficiently, and pleasantly.	48
12	1-16	That provision for advisory committee members, school personnel, and other people from the community give input to operation and evaluation of the program.	47
13	1-9	That the Distributive Education Program should be sensitive to changes in distributive and marketing practices and procedures as they are affected by societal, economic, technical, and educational developments, and adapt to such changes.	34
14	1-15	That provisions for a local chapter of DECA and activities be established to foster such activities as: social skills, leadership abilities, communication skills, etc.	27
15	1-11	That the Distributive Education program should strive to develop among employees and consumers a wider appreciation of the values of specifically trained personnel in distribution.	26
16	1-8	That the Distributive Education program should contribute to the improvement of the techniques in distribution and marketing.	24
17	1-14	That long range objectives be established to account for trends and changes that may affect clientele (e.g., population movement, and economic conditions).	13
18	1-13	That educational needs of adults in the local community should be served.	6

Table 21.--Ranking for Distributive Education Teachers, Teacher-Coordina-tors, and Local Vocational Education Administrators of Program Criteria.

Overall Rank		Criteria	Weighted Arithmetic Scale
1	2-2	Curriculum is directly related to requirements of an occupation.	134
2	2-1	Physical facilities and equipment are adequate for fulfilling program's purpose.	123
3	2-16	Student's work experience--the best possible placement of that student into a cooperative training station.	117
4	2-5	Instructional materials are current and suited to student's individual needs.	104
5	2-4	Instructional activities, methods and procedures (e.g., cooperative or project) used in teaching.	96
6	2-6	Guidance aspects--such as counseling--are provided by teacher-coordinator, employers, and guidance counselors (e.g., students have a career objective).	71*
7	2-3	Instructional content is based on performance objectives.	67
8	2-14	Supervisory practices/administration flexibility meet student needs.	60
9	2-9	Home, business and community relations are maintained on a continual basis.	51
10	2-18	Student outcomes--job satisfaction (e.g., student obtain, hold, and advance in jobs related to field of preparation.	50
11	2-8	Adequate staff are provided in order that all responsibilities of the job are accomplished.	49
12	2-13	Qualifications and professional growth of teachers is maintained and updated to insure program quality.	48

*Respondents were asked to rate the five most important evaluative criteria on a scale of 1-5. A weighted value of 5 was given to each criteria ranked 1 in importance. A value of 4 was given to each criterion ranked 2 in importance and so on, with a value of one given to the objective ranked 5 in importance.

Table 21.--Continued.

Overall Rank		Criteria	Weighted Arithmetic Scale
13	2-17	Labor market behavior--availability of jobs within community.	48
14	2-7	Extra-class activities (such as DECA, school store) are provided.	43
15	2-15	Organization of program is effective in facilitating instructional progress and program objectives.	42
16	2-20	Placement and follow-up of graduates are maintained on a continual basis.	27
17	2-11	Articulation--cooperation with other departments within school.	18
18	2-17	Labor market behavior--availability of jobs within community.	13
19	2-21	Advisory committee functions and is used effectively.	11
20	2-12	Library materials and facilities are provided on a centralized or decentralized basis.	10
21	1-10	Community resources such as physical size, economic base, natural resources and tax base are taken into consideration.	3

APPENDIX H

Table 22.--Total Response for Differences Between Programs and Objective 1-9 that the Distributive Education Program Should be Sensitive to Changes in Distributive and Marketing Practices and Procedures as They are Affected by Societal, Economic, Technical, and Educational Developments, and Adapt to Such Changes.

Objective Rating	Co-op P ₁	Project P ₂	Both P ₃
(1 & 2 = 1)			
Extremely Important to Very Important			
Frequency	22.0	1.0	26.0
Row Percent	52.4	25.0	78.8
Column Percent	44.9	2.0	53.1
Total Percent	27.8	1.3	32.9
(3, 4, 5, & 6 = 2)			
Moderately Important to No Importance			
Frequency	20.0	3.0	7.0
Row Percent	47.6	75.0	21.2
Column Percent	66.7	10.0	23.3
Total Percent	25.3	3.8	8.9
Raw Chi Square = 7.9233 with 2 degrees of Freedom Significance = .01			
GAMMA -.462			

Table 23.--Total Response for Differences Between Programs
and Criteria 2-7 that Extra-Class Activities
(Such as DECA & School Store) are Provided.

Objective Rating	Co-op P ₁	Project P ₂	Both P ₃
(1 & 2 = 1)			
Extremely Important to Very Important			
Frequency	10.0	3.0	23.0
Row Percent	23.8	75.0	69.7
Column Percent	27.8	8.3	63.9
Total Percent	12.7	3.8	29.1
(3, 4, 5, & 6 = 2)			
Moderately Important to No Importance			
Frequency	32.0	1.0	10.0
Row Percent	76.2	25.0	30.3
Column Percent	74.4	2.3	23.3
Total Percent	40.5	1.3	12.7
Raw Chi Square - 17.1594 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = .0002			
GAMMA -.7185			

Table 24.--Total Response for Differences between Programs and Criteria 2-9 that Home, Business and Community Relations are Maintained on a Continual Basis.

Objective Rating	Co-op P ₁	Project P ₂	Both P ₃
(1 & 2 = 1)			
Extremely Important to Very Important			
Frequency	17.0	2.0	23.0
Row Percent	40.5	50.0	69.7
Column Percent	40.5	4.8	54.8
Total Percent	21.5	2.5	29.1
(3, 4, 5, & 6 = 2)			
Moderately Important to No Importance			
Frequency	25.0	2.0	10.0
Row Percent	59.5	50.0	30.3
Column Percent	67.6	5.4	27.0
Total Percent	31.6	2.5	12.7
Raw Chi Square = 6.3540 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = .04			
GAMMA -.4994			

Table 25.--Total Response for Differences Between Position
and Criteria 2-7 that Extra-Class Activities
(Such as DECA & School Store) are Provided.

Objective Rating	Administrator	Coordinator	Teacher
(1 & 2 = 1)			
Extremely Important to Very Important			
Frequency	7.0	14.0	15.0
Row Percent	58.3	32.6	62.5
Column Percent	19.4	38.9	41.7
Total Percent	8.9	17.7	19.0
 (3, 4, 5, & 6 = 2)			
Moderately Important to No Importance			
Frequency	5.0	29.0	9.0
Row Percent	41.7	67.4	37.5
Column Percent	11.6	67.4	20.9
Total Percent	6.3	36.7	11.4
Raw Chi Square = 6.4966 with 2 Degrees of Freedom			
Significance = .03			
GAMMA -.1934			

Table 26.--Total Response for Differences between Years of Experience and Objective 1-1 that Preparation for Gainful Employment and for Advancement in a Distributive Occupation is the Primary Goal of the Distributive Education Program.

Objective Rating	1-3 Years	4-8 Years	9 Years & Over
(1 & 2 = 1)			
Extremely Important to Very Important			
Frequency	7.0	38.0	27.0
Row Percent	70.0	97.4	90.0
Column Percent	9.7	52.8	37.5
Total Percent	8.9	48.1	34.2
 (3, 4, 5, & 6 = 2)			
Moderately Important to No Importance			
Frequency	3.0	1.0	3.0
Row Percent	30.0	2.6	10.0
Column Percent	42.9	14.3	42.9
Total Percent	3.8	1.3	3.8
Raw Chi Square = 7.4964 with 2 Degrees of Freedom			
Significance = .02			

GAMMA -.2197

Table 27.--Total Response for Differences Between Processional Preparation and Objective 1-12 to Serve Students of Diverse Talents, Abilities, Interests, and Cultural Backgrounds.

Objective Rating	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Specialist and Doctorate Degree
(1 & 2 = 1)			
Extremely Important to Very Important			
Frequency	15.0	31.0	12.0
Row Percent	83.3	63.3	100.0
Column Percent	25.9	53.4	20.7
Total Percent	19.0	39.2	15.2
(3, 4, 5, & 6 = 2)			
Moderately Important to No Importance			
Frequency	3.0	18.0	0.0
Row Percent	16.7	35.7	0.0
Column Percent	14.3	85.7	0.0
Total Percent	3.8	22.8	0.0
Raw Chi Square = 7.8295 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = .02			
GAMMA -.1219			

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annual Local Self Evaluation of Vocational Education.

Richmond, Virginia: Division of Vocational Education, Department of Education, 1977.

Bannister, Talmadge E. "Evaluation of Facilities, Equipment, and Instructional Resources in Distributive Education Programs in Arkansas." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1969.

Barrata, Mary K. "Utilization of the Delphi Technique to Weight Program Evaluation Criteria in Vocational Education." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1974.

Byram, Harold M. Evaluation Systems for Local Programs of Vocational-Technical Education. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, October 1968.

Capstone Program Evaluation Model and Procedures.

Madison, Wisconsin: Department of Public Instruction, August 1977.

Coviello, Jane. "Evaluation of Vocational Program," Michigan Department of Education, Monograph 1977, Series of Vocational Education.

Crawford, Lucy C. "A Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Education." Vol. 1. Blacksburg, Virginia: Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1967.

Crawford, Lucy C., and Meyer, Warren G. Organization and Administration of Distributive Education. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Co., 1972.

Criteria for the Use of a School District in Evaluating Its Business Education Program, Revised Edition. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Department of Public Instruction, 1968.

Davis, Rodney E. "The Extent to Which Indiana Distributive Education Programs are Achieving Program Philosophy as Perceived by Students and Teacher-Coordina-tors." Ph.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1974.

Delta Pi Epsilon, (Tau Chapter). Evaluative Criteria for Business Departments of Secondary Schools, Mono-graph 90. South-Western Publishing Company, 1954.

Evaluative Criteria. National Study of Secondary School Evaluation, 4th Edition. Washington, D.C., 1969.

Ferguson, Edward T., Jr. "A Comparison of the Effectiveness of the Project and Cooperative Methods of Instruction on Selected Competencies in Distributive Education at the Secondary Level." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University.

Hutt, Roger. "Perception of Employers Regarding Cooperative Distributive Education Programs at the Secondary Level." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1975.

Johansen, Harold D. "An Evaluation of the Federally Reimbursed Distributive Education Programs in Iowa High Schools with Specific Reference to the Evaluative Guides as Developed by the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1963.

Luke, Cheryl M. "Criteria for the Evaluation of the Office Production Laboratory at the Secondary School Level." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1973.

Manpower and Vocational Education Weekly IV (November 5, 1975).

Mazzara, Andres A. "Evaluation and Michigan Vocational Education." Journal of Michigan Industrial Education Society (February 1976).

Meyer, Warren G. "Evaluative Criteria for Distributive Education." Business Education Forum (April 1961).

Michigan State Department of Education, Vocational Technical Services. "Career Education Planning District Summary." (January 1977).

- Mock, G. G. "An Evaluative Study of the Federally Reimbursable Part-Time Cooperative Distributive Education Programs in the Public Secondary Schools of Arkansas." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1965.
- PRIDE--Program Review for Improvement, Development, and Expansion in Vocational Education and Guidance. Division of Vocational Education and Guidance, Ohio State Department of Education, May 1976.
- Ristau, Robert and Falk, Ruel. "State and Local Preparation for Evaluation." Business Education Yearbook, Number 7, 1969.
- Ruff, Richard. "Evaluation in Distributive Education: A Challenge for the Future." The American Vocational Education Association Convention Division of Distributive Education, Houston, Texas, December 1976.
- Shack, Chrystine R. "The Conceptual Framework for the Evaluative Process." Business Education Yearbook, Number 7, 1969.
- Summary of the Meeting Between National Institute for Education and Vocational Education Researchers, Washington, D.C., May 1976.
- Taylor, Ruby F. "Standards for the Evaluation of Business and Office Education Programs Employing the Cooperative Part-Time Method of Instruction in the Secondary Schools." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1972.
- The Federal Register. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education, April 1977.
- Three Phase System for Statewide Evaluation of Occupational Education Programs. Springfield, Illinois: Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Department of Education, 1976.
- Uthe, Dr. Elaine, and Schroeder, Betty. "The Status of Cooperative Office Education Programs in Michigan 1967-1968." East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, April 1969, p. 30.
- Wall, Lewis, and Masterson, A. C. "Emerging Evaluation Approaches." Business Education Yearbook, Number 7, 1968.

- Weatherford, John W. Identification and Analysis of Issues in Distributive Education, SouthWestern Monographs 1974.
- Wentling, Tim, and Larson, Tom E. "Evaluating Occupational Education and Training Program." Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.
- Whitted, Mildred M. "Criteria for the Evaluation of Two-Year Federally Reimbursable Distributive Education Programs in the Junior College." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1969.
- Wyllie, Eugene D. "Criteria for the Evaluation of Secondary School Business Education Programs." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1961.