

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

5-1978

A Follow-Up Study of the Distributive Education Graduates of Sky View High School 1972-1976

Thomas J. Broberg
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports>



Part of the [Business Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Broberg, Thomas J., "A Follow-Up Study of the Distributive Education Graduates of Sky View High School 1972-1976" (1978). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 753.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/753>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Plan B and other Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



378
BYE17
C27

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES
OF SKY VIEW HIGH SCHOOL (1972-1976)

by
Thomas J. Broberg

A plan "B" report submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Business Education

Approval:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1978



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In appreciation and gratitude . . .

especially to Dr. Bill Stull for his encouragement, praise, and understanding as my graduate advisor.

to Dr. Charles Parker for his timely suggestions when I needed them the most.

to Dr. Reed Durtschi for his assistance and help.

to my parents for their love, support, and patience in seeing that I completed this study.

to my wife, LaDawn, and daughters, Nicole and Erika, for their sacrifice and understanding at all times.

to my sister, Julie, and her family for the help they gave me.

to the administration, staff, and former students of Sky View High School for their help and cooperation in completing this study.

Thomas J. Broberg

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Importance of the Study	4
Scope of the Study	5
Definitions	5
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Background Information	7
The Follow-up Study as an Evaluation Technique	10
Related Studies	11
The Furlong study (1974)	11
The Drake study (1974)	12
The Wilkinson study (1974)	13
The Michelettie study (1973)	14
Summary	14
PROCEDURE	16
Questionnaire	16
Pilot Study	17
The Personal Interview	17
Analysis of Data	18
Summary	18
FINDINGS	19
Description	20
Objective I	21
Objective II	23
Objective III	26
Objective IV	27
Objective V	28
Objective VI	28
Objective VII	34
Objective VIII	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	38
Summary	38
Conclusions	39
Recommendations	43
LITERATURE CITED	46
APPENDICES	48
Appendix A	49
Appendix B	50
VITA	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Employment Status (1972-1976) of Distributive Education Graduates	22
2. Number of Employers Since Graduation of the (1972-1976) Distributive Education Graduates	24
3. Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976) Studying or Training in Marketing	25
4. Type of Program (1972-1976) Distributive Education Graduates Are Attending	26
5. Reasons (1972-1976) Distributive Education Graduates Are Not Pursuing Further Study or Training	27
6. Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976) Employed in Marketing or Distribution	28
7. Reasons Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976) Are Not Pursuing Marketing as a Career	29
8. Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976) Preparation for First Job	30
9. Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976) Preparation for Present Job	30
10. Value of Classroom Instruction to Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)	31
11. Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976) Recommendation of Marketing for Other Students	32
12. Important Contributions of the Marketing Program to Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)	33
13. Participation in On-The-Job (Cooperative Training of Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)	35
14. Value of On-The-Job (Cooperative) Training to Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)	35
15. Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976) Belonging to DECA	36
16. Value of DECA to Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)	37

ABSTRACT

A Follow-up Study of the Distributive Education Graduates
of Sky View High School (1972-1976)

by

Thomas J. Broberg, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1978

Major Professor: Dr. William A. Stull
Department: Business Education

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of the distributive education program on the 1972-1976 distributive education graduates of Sky View High School. A random sample of 50 graduates from the 1972-1976 total population of distributive education graduates of Sky View High School was chosen and personally interviewed for this study. Ten sample students were selected from each class for the interviews.

The results of the study show that: (1) among the graduates surveyed there is a high rate of employment and job stability, (2) very few (14 percent) are studying or training in the marketing field, (3) employment in the marketing field is poor with less than half of those interviewed being currently employed in marketing, (4) very few had career intentions in the marketing field, (5) classroom instruction was adequate, (6) the on-the-job (cooperative phase) training portion was valuable to the vocational training of the graduates, and (7) participation in the Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) was somewhat valuable in the graduates' vocational training.

(60 pages)

INTRODUCTION

Distributive education is an instructional program that is designed to prepare people for careers in the distributive or marketing sector of the economy. Crawford and Meyer give a generally accepted definition of distributive education as:

. . . a vocational instructional program designed to meet the needs of persons who have entered or are preparing to enter a distributive occupation or an occupation requiring competency in one or more of the marketing functions. It offers instructions in marketing, merchandising, related management, and personal development.) (Crawford and Meyer, 1972, p. 2)

Educators in the distributive education field traditionally have agreed that the curriculum should include instruction in the following areas: social competency (human relations and consumer behavior), marketing competency, basic competency (communication and mathematics), product and service technology, and an understanding of the free enterprise system. These educators have also expressed the belief that basic economic and marketing concepts form the foundation for the distributive education curriculum (Crawford and Meyer, 1972, p. 39)5

The distributive education program is designed to place emphasis on the individual student and the career objectives of the student. The student is a person who needs and wants assistance in adjusting to the world of work and acquiring occupational training. Meyer, Crawford, and Klaurens emphasize the following:

When their career interests crystallize and their need to be employed becomes imminent, the career education curriculum provides opportunities to develop skills and knowledges that may be associated with specific occupations or occupational fields.) (Meyer, Crawford, and Klaurens, 1975, p. 102)

The student who is interested in a career in a specific distributive occupational area and is willing to work and learn has the potential to profit from such training.

In the curriculum of distributive education, the student is involved in an instructional program that has three main phases:

1. *The classroom phase.* This not only involves instruction in the basic marketing competencies previously mentioned in this report, but it also provides instruction related to the student's on-the-job work experience and career specialty.

2. *The cooperative phase.* The student is employed at a part-time job where he receives on-the-job training. This is an opportunity to apply the principles he has learned in the classroom and be given learning experiences which will develop and refine the occupational competencies needed to achieve his personal career objective.

3. *The co-curricular activity.* The Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) is the recommended activity designed to provide the student with social, competitive, and leadership opportunities.

The concern then becomes, how effective should a distributive education program be? How are the students progressing in their training on the jobs? What is the educational value of the courses being taught? Moss (1968) submits that evaluation of vocational education programs is necessary on moral, social, and scientific grounds.

A moral obligation to provide students with the best program possible;

A social obligation to spend the public investment in vocational, technical, and practical arts education with the greatest efficiency for society's welfare;

A scientific obligation to measure outcome to confirm or deny hypotheses in order to produce verifiable knowledge. (Moss, 1968, p. 2)

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of the distributive education program on the 1972-1976 distributive education graduates of Sky View High School.

Specifically, this study addressed the following questions:

1. What is the present employment status of Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976)?

2. Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) pursuing post-secondary study or training in marketing or in the distributive education field?

3. If Sky View High School distributive education graduates are not pursuing further study or training in marketing or distributive education, what are their major reasons for not studying or training in this career field?

4. Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) employed in a distributive (marketing) career or related occupation?

5. If Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) are not employed in the field of distribution (marketing), what are their major reasons for not entering this career field?

6. What opinions do Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) have concerning the value of the classroom portion of the distributive education program?

7. What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the on-the-job (cooperative phase) of the distributive education program?

8. What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the co-curricular organization, The Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA)?

Importance of the Study

One of the serious problems facing our society today is the lack of well trained personnel. A commitment to this problem facing professional-technical educators is to provide training and education which will help incorporate these people into the mainstream of the American economy. Help is needed to bring about better utilization of the untrained to improve their potential skills in business and in industry (Parr, 1972, p. 18).

Parr states:

. . . Society has a responsibility to young people which it must meet either through providing jobs for them or through education. If the private sector could not provide a sufficient number of jobs, then some other agent of society must provide useful and growth promoting experiences. (Parr, 1972, p. 19)

Nelson (1972, p. 18) states: "The goal of the Distributive Education Program is to prepare the student for marketing employment." Many states have established vocational education programs within their school systems for this very purpose. Distributive education is just one of the disciplines that fall under the vocational education spectrum. In order to ascertain the quality of a distributive education program and to make decisions that will measure up to the responsibility that society has to its young people, it is necessary to evaluate a program's strengths and weaknesses using a systematic evaluation procedure (Meyer, Crawford, and Klaurens, 1975, p. 267).

A follow-up study of former students is one of the ways that this systematic evaluation can be made. The focus of this evaluation technique should indicate the product or outcome of the system. A study of former students will help to obtain positive feedback of the effectiveness of the education program (McKinney and Oglesby, 1971, p. 1).

A program in the distributive education area was initiated at Sky View High School in 1968. A follow-up study of program graduates is deemed necessary to provide coordinators and teachers with a comprehensive, constructive evaluation of program effectiveness. McKinney and Oglesby emphasize the following:

. . . In other words students are asked to reflect back on how the program in question either prepared him or failed to prepare him for his future work. It should be remembered that follow-up studies are not the complete answer for evaluating educational systems. They are but one important component of a larger design for evaluating the educational endeavor. (McKinney and Oglesby, 1971, p. 1)

Scope of the Study

A random sample of 50 graduates from the 1972-1976 total population of distributive education graduates of Sky View High School was chosen and personally interviewed for this study. Ten sample students were selected from each class according to the parameters of living within a 100-mile radius of Smithfield, Utah, and being enrolled in the distributive education program while attending Sky View High School.

Definitions

Distribution (marketing). Everything that happens to a product from the time it leaves the producer or manufacturer until it reaches the ultimate consumer.

Distributive education. A vocational instructional program designed to meet the needs of persons who have entered, or are preparing to enter, a distributive occupation, or an occupation requiring competency in one or more of the marketing functions. It offers instruction in marketing, merchandising, related management, and personal development (Crawford and Meyer, 1972).

Distributive occupations. Occupations followed by persons engaged primarily in the marketing or merchandising of goods and services (Coakley, 1972).

Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA). A youth organization providing a program of activities which complements and enriches distributive curriculums (Coakley, 1972, p. 181).

Marketing functions. These include selling, buying, promoting, transporting, storing, pricing, financing, marketing research, and marketing management (USOE, Instructional Program Codes for Distributive Education, 1977).

Occupational (career) objective. A current career goal, selected by the student, the preparation for which is the purpose of his vocational instruction in distribution and marketing (Coakley, 1972).

Related occupation. An occupation requiring competency in one or more of the marketing functions.

Teacher-coordinator. A member of the local school staff who teaches distributive and related subject matter to students preparing for employment and coordinates classroom instruction with on-the-job training, or with occupationally oriented learning activities of students. He is responsible for the distributive education program in the school. Responsibility for adult distributive education may vary (Coakley, 1972).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE


Background Information

The purpose of this chapter will be: (1) to trace the history and development of distributive education in the United States, (2) to discuss the follow-up study as an evaluation technique, and (3) to review other studies as they relate to this paper.

A form of distributive education can be traced back to ancient Egypt, nearly 7,000 years ago. When a boy became of age he would begin his career as a simple apprentice that would center around his father's trade (such as merchant). When he had developed his skills to a certain point, he would then start a business for himself (Muhlhorn, 1959, p. 56).

In this country, much of the early education for distributive occupations was in the form of salesmanship training conducted by companies for their own employees. In 1905, Mrs. Lucinda Prince established the first retail training class. This was accomplished in cooperation with the Woman's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston. Distributive education programs were started in some high schools as early as 1910. A number of these early programs received modest growth and again were largely directed toward retail selling (Meyer and Furtado, 1976).

Distributive education, as we know it today, came into its own with the passage of the George-Dearn Act of 1936, when it became part of the federally funded vocational programs. For the first time, Congress was authorized to appropriate annually up to \$1.2 million

for reimbursement of vocational programs in distributive occupations. The number of distributive education programs began to grow and has increased every year since (Meyer and Furtado, 1976). 

Enrollment in distributive education in 1965 was approximately 300,000 and increased in 1973 to around 700,000 students. By 1980, it is expected that the enrollment in distributive education will increase to about 1,115,000 students and trainees (Nelson, 1973).

The curriculum in distributive education has also experienced many changes during its development as a vocational education discipline. Today the emphasis is on the traditional approach of developing competencies in marketing and retailing. In addition, through the cooperative education method and the project method, specialized instruction may be provided by the teacher/coordinator for those students who have career interests and objectives in the specialized marketing areas. Stull and Winn point out the need for such specialization:

. . . Many, if not the majority of DE teachers-coordinators, have advertized their programs, as designed to prepare individuals for a broad range of careers found in the marketing and distribution occupational family. Yet, the majority of instructional efforts have been, by tradition, oriented toward the development of competencies required in retailing or general merchandising. This is a great aid for those students interested in this career area, but fails to provide any type of instruction in the other 16 marketing and distribution specializations. . . . Utah is now in the process of developing and implementing a new instructional system designed to address the dilemma of specialized needs of students and the employment community. Referred to as "PLUS" (Personalized Learning Unit System), this system is built around the 20 occupational specialties found in the marketing and distribution family. Under this concept the DE teacher/coordinator role changes from one of expert in subject matter to facilitator of specialized student learning. (Stull and Winn, 1975, p. 6)

The United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare lists the following as distributive occupations (U.S. Office of Education, 1977):

1. Advertising services.
2. Apparel and accessories.
3. Automotive.
4. Finance and credit.
5. Floristry.
6. Food distribution.
7. Food services.
8. General merchandise.
9. Hardware, building materials, farm and garden supplies.
10. Home furnishing.
11. Hotel and lodging.
12. Industrial marketing.
13. Insurance.
14. International trade.
15. Personal services.
16. Petroleum.
17. Real estate.
18. Recreation and tourism.
19. Transportation.

Today there is great concern on the part of the public over the expenditures that are being made on public education. The total national spending on distributive education in 1975 was estimated to be about \$110,000,000. The American taxpayer is demanding that education programs, including vocational education programs, be held accountable and show a measure of their effectiveness in the overall education of their youth. The public wants and has the right to know whether education is producing results (Huffman, 1969).

It must be re-emphasized that the goal of distributive education is to prepare people for marketing employment opportunity; that is, prepare them and place them in a job (Nelson, 1973).

The Follow-up Study as an Evaluation Technique

The student follow-up is one of the processes available to measure accountability of a vocational program and is considered one of the most valuable techniques for assessing vocational education systems outcomes. The follow-up study is a method by which the educational institution can evaluate the effectiveness of its program (Iliff, 1966-1967).

Meyer, Crawford, and Klaurens in talking about program evaluation state: "In order to determine the quality of a program and to make enlightened decisions that will result in positive changes, it is necessary to assess the program's strengths and weaknesses using systematic evaluation procedures" (1975, p. 267).

The follow-up study as an evaluation technique is important because it puts emphasis on the output of the educational system. It looks at former students to determine the effects of the distributive education program on them, it looks at what has happened to them, and it looks at what has been the impact upon the institution and its program (Best, 1970).

McKinney and Oglesby explain what a follow-up study is:

A follow-up study is a procedure for accumulating pertinent data from or about individuals after they have had similar or comparable experiences. It is important to remember that follow-up implies the collection of data about something which has already taken place. (McKinney and Oglesby, 1971, p. 1)

Some distributive education teacher/coordinators look at follow-up studies as a threat to their teaching methods or to a particular program they may be using. In distributive education the purpose of evaluation is improvement--improvement of teaching, improvement of coordination, improvement of program operation. The follow-up study should then obtain information which assists the teacher/coordinator in determining the extent to which the objectives of the educational system are being met. The follow-up study then becomes an indication of what areas require change, additions of new programs, deletions of others, or revision of existing programs (McKinney and Oglesby, 1971).

Meyer, Crawford, and Klaurens (1975) list the following kinds of data that may be gathered from student follow-up studies:

1. Jobs they have held.
2. Salaries of employed graduates.
3. Attitudes toward the program.
4. Areas of weakness.
5. Recommended program changes.
6. Future educational and vocational plans.
7. Job satisfaction.

Related Studies

The purpose of this section is to review studies completed with subjects that relate to this report. Each of the following studies were conducted at the high school level.

The Furlong study (1974). This was a follow-up study of distributive education graduates of 1967 through 1972 at Mound High School in Mound, Minnesota. A total of 92 completed questionnaires

was returned from a potential of 98 student graduates for a return rate of 94 percent. The pertinent findings of this study are:

1. Mound High School distributive education graduates remain in distributive occupations in about the same percentage as do graduates of other distributive education programs.

2. Since graduation from high school, the majority of the distributive education graduates have had three or fewer employers.

3. Of the 92 respondents, 47 percent indicated that the distributive education program did a good-to-excellent job of preparing them for their present employment.

4. Over 60 percent of the distributive education graduates continued their education.

5. Eighty-three percent of the distributive education graduates were satisfied to well satisfied with their jobs and occupational fields.

The Drake study (1974). This was a follow-up study of 1971-1972 distributive occupation terminees of secondary vocational programs of Alabama. A total of 1,779 terminees were sent questionnaires of which 546 responded for a return rate of 30.7 percent. The related findings of this study show that:

1. Fifty-three percent of the respondents indicated that during the time they were taking their distributive education program, they intended to get a job in the area in which they were studying.

2. Seventy percent of the respondents indicated they would select the same vocational program if they had the choice to make again.

3. Fifty-one percent of the respondents indicated that their vocational training prepared them from "well prepared" to "excellent" for their first job.

4. Forty-three percent of the respondents who were working indicated that their training prepared them from "well prepared" to "excellent" for their present job.

5. Seventy-nine percent rated the quality of the teaching by their vocational instructor from "good" to "excellent."

6. Forty-two percent of the cooperative students indicated they were working at the same establishment where they did their cooperative training.

7. Seventy-two percent of the respondents were employed in "directly" or "somewhat directly" related areas to their training.

8. Forty-two percent of the respondents were continuing their education.

The Wilkinson study (1974). A dissertation on the comparison of cooperative distributive education graduates with non-cooperative distributive education graduates at selected public secondary schools in the state of Iowa indicated the following conclusions:

1. Cooperative distributive education employees obtain jobs faster than non-cooperative distributive education employees.

2. Cooperative distributive education employees have more job security than do non-cooperative distributive education employees during the first 15 months after graduation from high school.

3. Cooperative distributive education employees do not perform on the job any better than do the non-cooperative distributive education employees.

4. The cooperative distributive education program does not prepare students for the field of work any better than other programs offered in high schools.

The Michelettie study (1973). This follow-up study was a field study project of distributive education graduates of Providence Public High Schools, Providence, Rhode Island. Related findings and conclusions of this study show that:

1. Forty-two percent of the former students seek additional educational training after high school.

2. Fifty-eight percent of the former students leave the job they had while in the distributive education program within six months after graduation.

3. Forty percent of the former students are employed in the distributive or marketing field.

4. Eighty-seven percent of the former students stated that they would take the distributive education program again.

5. The majority of the former students indicated that the course content was adequate and the teacher/coordinators were competent.

Summary

Today educational systems are becoming more responsible to the public in measuring the effectiveness of their programs. Such measurement is essential because of the great potential for growth and expansion of the distributive education programs in the future.

The previously cited studies indicate that the distributive education programs in which these follow-up studies were conducted are fairly successful in meeting the objectives of their programs.

It is also evident that there is room for improving areas of these programs.

The findings and conclusions of this study will determine the impact and effectiveness of the Sky View High School distributive education program.

PROCEDURE

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the procedures used to obtain the information and data that will be incorporated in helping determine the effectiveness of the distributive education program at Sky View High School.

Permission to conduct this study was obtained from Mr. John A. Hansen, Principal at Sky View High School; Mr. Irel M. Eppich, Cache County Vocational Education Director; and Mr. J. Grant Brough, Distributive Education Teacher/Coordinator at Sky View High School.

The randomly selected graduates were contacted individually by a letter of introduction and explanation endorsed by the principal of Sky View High School. After this initial contact, subsequent contact by phone established personal interview appointments with each of the participants mentioned above.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire was developed using a modification of the graduate follow-up questionnaire found in the Utah Vocational Education Management-Delivery Guide (1976). This questionnaire was divided into six main sections. The sections were developed as follows:

1. *The employment status section.* This section contains questions regarding the general employment background on the former graduates.
2. *The related post-secondary schooling or training section.* In this section questions were asked regarding the career intentions of the former graduates who may be pursuing further study or training.

3. *The related marketing employment status section.* This section deals with questions centered around the above graduates' past and present occupations and employment status, and how it relates to the course of study that he/she received in distributive education.

4. *The classroom instruction section.* The value of the classroom instruction on the former graduates came from questions within this section.

5. *The on-the-job training section.* This section measures the value of the on-the-job (cooperative) phase and its effectiveness and how it relates to the distributive educational program.

6. *The Distributive Education Clubs of America.* From this section, questions were used to determine the value of The Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) as part of the selected graduates' vocational training. (See Appendix A, page 49.)

Pilot Study

A pilot study was completed using the above questionnaire. Personal interviews were conducted with five students who were attending the Cache Valley Mall Marketing Program. These interviews were the basis for this pilot study. Except for minor corrections, the researcher determined that the questionnaire was an accurate and complete one. The personal interview technique seemed to be an effective way of obtaining the data necessary for this study.

The Personal Interview

The personal interview technique was used to conduct this study. Ten graduates from each graduating class (1972-1976) were selected on a random basis. This random basis was used according to a sequential

order whereby graduates were selected and contacted. If the graduate was unavailable, another graduate was chosen from the random sequence until 10 graduates from each graduating class had been interviewed. Names and addresses of the above graduates were obtained from the records of Sky View High School.

An introductory letter was sent to the selected graduates five days prior to a telephone contact. This contact was used to set up an appointment for the selected interview. The interviews were held in the selected graduates' homes by the researcher. For the interview, the questionnaire was followed as previously outlined. All interviews were conducted in such a way that bias was held to a minimum.

Analysis of Data

After the collection of data, a statistical analysis based on the measures of central tendency (mean) and percentages was made. All data were tabulated manually and recorded in tables that consisted of frequency counts and percentages. The accumulated data were used in making conclusions and recommendations.

Summary

A follow-up study of the 1972-1976 graduates of Sky View High School was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the distributive education program. A personal interview was held during which the "Graduate Follow-up Questionnaire" was completed. The information from this questionnaire was organized and tabulated so that conclusions and recommendations could be formulated.

FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the data obtained from the "Graduate Follow-up Questionnaire" used in the selected personal interviews mentioned in the Procedure chapter of this report. The objectives of this study, written in question form, are as follows:

1. What is the present employment status of Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976)?
2. Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) pursuing post-secondary study or training in marketing or in the distributive education field?
3. If Sky View High School distributive education graduates are not pursuing further study or training in marketing or distributive education, what are their major reasons for not studying or training in this career field?
4. Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) employed in a distributive (marketing) career or related occupation?
5. If Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) are not employed in the field of distribution (marketing), what are their major reasons for not entering this career field?
6. What opinions do Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) have concerning the value of the classroom portion of the distributive education program?

7. What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the on-the-job (cooperative phase) of the distributive education program?

8. What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the co-curricular organization, The Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA)?

Description

Sixteen questions, designed to evaluate the stated objectives, formulated the questionnaire. The following questions are those used by the researcher to gather his data.

1. What is your present employment status?
2. How many employers have you worked for since graduation?
3. Are you presently studying or training in marketing or in a related field?
4. What type of program are you attending?
5. If not pursuing further study or training in marketing, please indicate the reason.
6. Are you presently employed in a distributive or marketing occupation?
7. If not, what is the major reason for not pursuing marketing or distribution as a career?
8. Rate how well your marketing or distributive education program prepared you for your first job after graduation.
9. Rate how well your marketing or distributive education program prepared you for your present job.

10. Rate how valuable you thought the marketing or distributive education classroom instruction was to your vocational training.

11. Did you participate in the on-the-job training portion of your marketing or distributive education program?

12. If you did participate in the on-the-job training portion of your marketing or distributive education program, rate how valuable the on-the-job training was to your vocational training.

13. Did you belong to DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America)?

14. If you belonged to DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America), rate how valuable this was to your vocational training.

15. Based on your total training experiences, would you recommend the marketing or distributive education program to other students?

16. What were the most important contributions of the marketing or distributive education program to you?

The subsequent findings are arranged in order of sequence by the stated objectives of this report. Each objective is then followed by the questions and the corresponding tabulated data that relate to that objective.

Objective I

What is the present employment status of Sky View High School (1972-1976) distributive education graduates?

The following data were tabulated from the responses to question one (Table 1), "What is your present employment status?"

Of the 50 graduates that were interviewed, 33 (66%) were employed on a full-time basis and 9 (18%) were employed part-time. The data

Table 1
 Employment Status (1972-1976) of Distributive Education Graduates

Employment	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Full-time (35 or more hours per week)	7 (70%)	6 (60%)	5 (50%)	7 (70%)	8 (80%)	33 (66%)
Part-time (less than 35 hours per week)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	9 (18%)
Not employed: Looking for work	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Not employed: Not looking for work	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	6 (12%)
Going to school full time	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	9 (18%)

reveal that of those graduates that were not employed, 6 (12%) were not looking for work. The interviews of the 50 graduates show that 9 (18%) were going to school (post-secondary) on a full-time basis.

The responses to question two (Table 2), "How many employers have you worked for since graduation?," reveal the following data:

Of the 50 graduates that were interviewed, 12 (14%) have had one employer, 14 (28%) had two employers, 14 (28%) had three employers, and 9 (18%) have had four or more employers since graduating from high school. One student (2%) had not been employed since graduating from high school.

The totals relating to the above stated objective reveal that 42 (84%) of the graduates were employed either full time or part time. Totals also revealed that 6 (12%) of the graduates interviewed were not employed, but also were not looking for work. Employment figures among the graduates that were interviewed showed that 40 (80%) had fewer than four employers since graduating from high school. The data also reveal that 9 (18%) of the graduates interviewed had four or more employers since graduation from high school. Nine (18%) of the graduates interviewed were going to school (post-secondary) on a full-time basis. Of the 50 graduates that were interviewed, only 1 (2%) had not been employed since graduation from high school.

Objective II

Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) pursuing post-secondary study or training in marketing or distributive education?

Table 2

Number of Employers Since Graduation of the (1972-1976)

Distributive Education Graduates

Number of employers	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
One	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	12 (24%)
Two	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	14 (28%)
Three	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	14 (28%)
Four or more	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	9 (18%)
Have not been employed since graduation	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)

The following data were tabulated from the responses to question three (Table 3), "Are you presently studying or training in marketing or in a related field?"

Table 3
Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)
Studying or Training in Marketing

Response	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Yes	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	7 (14%)
No	9 (90%)	8 (80%)	7 (70%)	10 (100%)	9 (90%)	43 (86%)

Of the 50 graduates interviewed, 7 (14%) were studying or training in marketing or a related field.

The following data were tabulated from the responses to question four (Table 4), "What type of program are you attending?"

Of the 20 respondents, 14 (70%) indicated they were attending a four-year college or university, 1 (5%) was attending a private business school, 1 (5%) was attending an apprentice program, 3 (15%) were attending a business or industry training program, and 1 (5%) was receiving military training.

The totals revealed that 20 (40%) of the graduates interviewed were attending or participating in some form of study or training. Of the 50 graduates interviewed, 7 (14%) were studying or training in marketing or distributive education. Of those 20 respondents that were receiving further study or training, 14 (70%) indicated they were

Table 4
 Type of Program (1972-1976) Distributive Education
 Graduates Are Attending

Type of program	Number attending
Two year college	0
Four year college or university	14 (70%)
Private business school	1 (5%)
Apprentice program	1 (5%)
Adult vocational education classes	0 (0%)
Business or industry training program	3 (15%)
Military training	1 (5%)

attending a four-year college or university, 1 (5%) was attending a private business school, 1 (5%) was attending an apprentice program, 3 (15%) were attending a business or industry training program, and 1 (5%) was receiving military training.

Objective III

If Sky View High School distributive education graduates are not pursuing further study or training in marketing or distributive education, what are their major reasons for not studying or training in this career field?

The following data were tabulated from the responses to question five (Table 5), "If not pursuing further study or training in marketing, please indicate the reason."

Table 5
Reasons (1972-1976) Distributive Education Graduates
Are Not Pursuing Further Study or Training

Reasons	Total responses
Never planned to work in that field	3 (23.1%)
I do not like that type of work	1 (7.7%)
Too little opportunity in the career field	2 (15.4%)
Disliked studying and training in this field of work	0 (0.0%)
Found another career field I liked better	7 (53.8%)

Of the 13 respondents, 3 (23.1%) never planned to work in that field, 1 (7.7%) did not like that type of work, 2 (15.4%) felt there was too little opportunity in the career field, and 7 (53.8%) found another career field they liked better.

Objective IV

Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) employed in a distributive (marketing) or related occupation?

The responses to question six (Table 6), "Are you presently employed in a distributive or marketing occupation?," contain the following data:

Of the 50 graduates interviewed, 20 (40%) indicated that they were employed in a marketing or distributive occupation.

Table 6
 Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)
 Employed in Marketing or Distribution

Response	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Yes	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	6 (60%)	20 (40%)
No	5 (50%)	8 (80%)	6 (60%)	7 (70%)	4 (40%)	30 (60%)

Objective V

If Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) are not employed in the field of distribution (marketing), what are their major reasons for not entering this career field?

Question seven (Table 7), "If not, what is the major reason for not pursuing marketing or distribution as a career?," reveals the following tabulated data:

Of the 30 respondents, 9 (30%) never planned to work in that field, 2 (7%) indicated they did not like that type of work, 4 (13%) found too little opportunity in the career field, 1 (3%) disliked the working conditions, and 14 (47%) found another career field they liked better.

Objective VI

What opinions do Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) have concerning the value of the classroom portion of the distributive education program?

Table 7
Reasons Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)
Are Not Pursuing Marketing as a Career

Reasons	Total Responses
Never planned to work in that field	9 (30%)
Tried, but unable to find a job in that field	0
Feel I did not learn enough in the marketing program	0
Pay was too low	0
I did not like that type of work	2 (7%)
Too little opportunity in the career field	4 (13%)
Disliked the working conditions	1 (3%)
Found another career field I like better	14 (47%)

Responses to question eight (Table 8), "Rate how well your marketing or distributive education program prepared you for your first job after graduation," give the following data.

The information that was obtained from the interviews of the 50 graduates showed how well the distributive education program prepared them for their first job: 6 (12%) indicated excellent, 32 (64%) indicated good, 11 (22%) indicated fair, and 1 (2%) indicated very poor.

The calculated responses to question nine (Table 9), "Rate how well your marketing or distributive education program prepared you for your present job," reveal the following data:

Of the 44 responses to this question, in rating how well the distributive education program prepared the graduates that were interviewed

Table 8
Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)
Preparation for First Job

Rating	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Excellent	0	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	0	2 (20%)	6 (12%)
Good	6 (60%)	6 (60%)	7 (70%)	7 (70%)	6 (60%)	32 (64%)
Fair	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	0	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	11 (22%)
Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very poor	0	0	1 (10%)	0	0	1 (02%)

Table 9
Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)
Preparation for Present Job

Rating	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Excellent	0	2 (22%)	0	0	0	2 (05%)
Good	2 (25%)	3 (33%)	2 (25%)	4 (40%)	5 (56%)	16 (36%)
Fair	3 (38%)	3 (33%)	4 (50%)	2 (20%)	3 (33%)	15 (34%)
Poor	1 (13%)	1 (11%)	0	3 (30%)	1 (11%)	6 (14%)
Very poor	0	0	1 (13%)	0	0	1 (02%)
Still have my first job	2 (25%)	0	1 (13%)	1 (10%)	0	4 (09%)

for their present jobs, 2 (5%) indicated excellent, 16 (36%) indicated good, 15 (34%) indicated very poor, and 4 (9%) indicated they still had their first job since graduation from high school.

The following data were tabulated from the responses to question 10 (Table 10), "Rate how valuable you thought the marketing or distributive education classroom instruction was to your vocational training."

Table 10
Value of Classroom Instruction to Distributive
Education Graduates (1972-1976)

Rating	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Very valuable	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0	5 (10%)
Valuable	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	7 (70%)	5 (50%)	7 (70%)	27 (54%)
Somewhat valuable	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	18 (36%)
Of no value	0	0	0	0	0	0

Of the 50 graduates that were interviewed, 5 (10%) thought the classroom instruction was very valuable, 27 (54%) felt that the classroom instruction was valuable, 18 (36%) indicated the classroom instruction was somewhat valuable.

The data gleaned from question 15 (Table 11), "Based on your total training experiences, would you recommend the marketing or distributive education program to other students?," reveal the following:

Table 11
Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976) Recommendation
of Marketing for Other Students

Response	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Yes	9 (90%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	49 (98%)
No	1 (10%)	0	0	0	0	1 (02%)

Of the 50 graduates interviewed, 49 (98%) would recommend the marketing or distributive education program to other students.

The following data were tabulated from the responses to question 16 (Table 12), "What were the most important contributions of the marketing or distributive education program to you?"

1. "Learned to get along with other people" ranked first 18 (5.1%) times and second 11 (3.1%) times.

2. "Identified personal strengths and weaknesses" ranked first 10 (2.9%) times and second 8 (2.3%) times.

3. "Learned to be an effective worker" ranked first 4 (1.1%) times and second 14 (4%) times.

The responses that were ranked the lowest were as follows:

1. "Decided whether to go to college" ranked sixth 14 (4%) times and seventh 28 (8%) times.

2. "Firmed up my career plans" ranked sixth 22 (6.3%) and seventh 10 (2.9%) times.

The totals of this objective revealed that of the 50 graduates, 38 (76%) felt that the distributive education program prepared them for

Table 12
 Important Contributions of the Marketing Program to
 Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)

Contributions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Firmed up my career plans	0	5 (1.4%)	2 (0.6%)	4 (1.1%)	7 (2.0%)	22 (6.3%)	10 (2.9%)
Identified personal strengths and weaknesses	10 (2.9%)	8 (2.3%)	9 (2.6%)	7 (2.0%)	11 (3.1%)	5 (1.4%)	0
Decided whether to go to college	0	4 (1.1%)	0	4 (1.1%)	0	14 (4.0%)	28 (8.0%)
Developed job skills that helped me get a good job	9 (2.6%)	2 (0.6%)	7 (2.0%)	9 (2.6%)	15 (4.3%)	5 (1.4%)	3 (0.9%)
Learned to get along with other people	18 (5.1%)	11 (3.1%)	8 (2.3%)	8 (2.3%)	2 (0.6%)	0	3 (0.9%)
Learned to be an effective worker	4 (1.1%)	14 (4.0%)	12 (3.4%)	10 (2.9%)	5 (1.4%)	2 (0.6%)	3 (0.9%)
Developed confidence in my abilities	8 (2.3%)	7 (2.0%)	11 (3.1%)	10 (2.9%)	6 (1.7%)	6 (1.7%)	2 (0.6%)

their first job after graduation from high school in either a good or an excellent manner. In preparing them for their present job, 22 (44%) felt that the distributive education program did a very poor to fair job in preparing them for their present employment. In evaluating the value of classroom instruction, 32 (64%) of the 50 graduates felt the classroom instruction was valuable to very valuable. Of the 50 graduates that were interviewed, 49 (98%) would recommend the marketing or distributive education class to other students. The totals continue to reveal that when determining the most important contributions of the marketing or distributive education program, the 50 interviewees indicated that learning to get along with other people ranked the highest, with 18 (5.1%) of the graduates ranking that response first and 11 (3.1%) of the graduates ranking it second.

Objective VII

What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the on-the-job (cooperative phase) of the distributive education program?

The following data were tabulated from the responses to question 11 (Table 13), "Did you participate in the on-the-job training portion of your marketing or distributive education program?"

Of the 50 graduates that were interviewed, 41 (82%) indicated that they participated in the on-the-job (cooperative phase) training portion of the marketing or distributive education program at Sky View High School.

From the data that were tabulated, the following are responses to question 12 (Table 14), "If you did participate in the on-the-job

Table 13
 Participation in On-The-Job (Cooperative) Training
 of Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)

Response	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Yes	6 (60%)	9 (90%)	8 (80%)	10 (100%)	8 (80%)	41 (82%)
No	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	2 (80%)	0	2 (20%)	9 (18%)

training portion of your marketing or distributive education program, rate how valuable the on-the-job training was to your vocational training."

Table 14
 Value of On-The-Job (Cooperative) Training to
 Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)

Rating	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Very valuable	3 (50%)	3 (33%)	3 (38%)	2 (20%)	5 (63%)	16 (39%)
Valuable	2 (33%)	6 (67%)	3 (38%)	7 (70%)	1 (13%)	19 (46%)
Somewhat valuable	0	0	2 (24%)	1 (10%)	2 (24%)	5 (12%)
Of no value	1 (17%)	0	0	0	0	1 (03%)

Concerning the value of the on-the-job (cooperative phase) portion of the distributive education program, 16 (39%) of the 41

respondents to this question indicated they thought it was very valuable, 19 (46%) thought it was valuable, 5 (12%) thought it was somewhat valuable, and 1 (3%) thought it had no value.

The totals of this objective revealed that 41 (82%) of the 50 graduates interviewed participated in the on-the-job portion of the distributive education program. Of those that did participate, 35 (85%) felt that this training was valuable to very valuable.

Objective VIII

What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the co-curricular organization, The Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA)?

The tabulated data from the responses to question 13 (Table 15), "Did you belong to DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America)?," reveal:

From the 50 graduates interviewed, 45 (90%) indicated that they did belong to DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America).

Table 15
Distributive Education Graduates (1972-1976)
Belonging to DECA

Response	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Yes	7 (70%)	10 (100%)	9 (90%)	10 (100%)	9 (90%)	45 (90%)
No	3 (30%)	0	1 (10%)	0	1 (10%)	5 (10%)

The following data are tabulated from the responses to question 14 (Table 16), "If you belonged to DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America), rate how valuable this was to your vocational training."

Table 16
Value of DECA to Distributive Education
Graduates (1972-1976)

Rating	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	Total
Very valuable	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	6 (13.3%)
Valuable	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	16 (35.6%)
Somewhat valuable	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	6 (60%)	3 (30%)	23 (51.1%)
Of no value	0	0	0	0	0	0

Of the 45 graduates that responded to this question, 6 (13.3%) felt that their belonging to DECA was very valuable, 16 (35.6%) thought it was valuable, and 23 (51.1%) thought it was somewhat valuable to their vocational training.

The totals of this objective reveal that 45 (90%) of the graduates interviewed belonged to DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America). The totals also show that 45 graduates did belong to DECA, 22 (48.9%) thought their participation in DECA was valuable to very valuable to their vocational training, and 23 (51.1%) felt their participation to be somewhat valuable as it related to their vocational training.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of the distributive education program on the 1972-1976 distributive education graduates of Sky View High School. The specific objectives or questions to be answered were as follows:

1. What is the present employment status of Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976)?

2. Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) pursuing post-secondary study or training in marketing or distributive education?

3. If Sky View High School distributive education graduates are not pursuing further study or training in marketing or distributive education, what are their major reasons for not studying or training in this career field?

4. Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) employed in the field of distribution (marketing) or a related occupation?

5. If Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) are not employed in a distributive (marketing) or related occupation, what are their major reasons for not entering this career field?

6. What opinions do Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) have concerning the value of the classroom portion of the distributive education program?

7. What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the on-the-job (cooperative phase) of the distributive education program?

8. What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the co-curricular organization, The Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA)?

The study was conducted as a personal interview of 50 graduates from 1972-1976, with 10 students being interviewed from each graduating class. The "Graduate Follow-up Questionnaire" was used as the primary instrument for surveying the above graduates.

Conclusions

In this section the researcher will state his conclusions, arrived at as a result of the data and findings obtained from the "Graduate Follow-up Questionnaire." The format of this section will be to list each of the eight objectives and describe each objective with a statement of conclusion.

1. *What is the present employment status of Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976)?*

The results of the interviews indicated 84% of the graduates that were interviewed were employed either full time or part time. The data also revealed that 12% of the graduates interviewed were not employed, but more than that, were not looking for employment at the present time. Further, of those graduates interviewed, 18% indicated that they were going to school (post-secondary) on a full-time basis. One of the above graduates interviewed indicated that he/she had not been employed since graduation from high school.

Data gleaned from the above objective indicate to the researcher that the graduates interviewed have a high rate of employment and have a high rate of stability in their jobs.

2. *Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) pursuing post-secondary study or training in marketing or distributive education?*

The results show that 40% of the graduates interviewed were attending or participating in some form of post-secondary training or study. Of the 50 interviewed, 14% were studying or training in marketing or distributive education.

As a conclusion to this objective, very few of the graduates are pursuing further study or training in distribution (marketing).

3. *If Sky View High School distributive education graduates are not pursuing further study or training in marketing or distributive education, what are their major reasons for not studying or training in this career field?*

The two most often mentioned responses of the 13 respondents to this question were: (a) 53.8% indicated they found another career field they liked better, and (b) 23.1% indicated they never planned to work in the field of distribution.

The findings of this question indicate to the researcher that very few of the graduates interviewed had career intentions in the field of distribution (marketing).

4. *Are Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) employed in a distributive (marketing) or related occupation?*

Data obtained from the interviews pertaining to this objective reveal that 40% of the graduates were employed in a marketing or distributive occupation.

In concluding from the summarized data, employment in distribution (marketing) among the graduates interviewed is poor for the time and training they have received.

5. *If Sky View High School distributive education graduates are not employed in the field of distribution (marketing), what are their major reasons for not entering this career field?*

In reaction to this objective, the two most often mentioned answers of the 30 respondents were: (a) 47% of the respondents indicated they found another career field they liked better, and (b) 30% indicated they never planned to work in the field of distribution (marketing).

Based on the data received, the conclusion to this objective would be that a large percentage of the graduates interviewed did not have a strong career objective relating to distribution (marketing) as a career.

6. *What opinions do Sky View High School distributive education graduates (1972-1976) have concerning the value of the classroom portion of the distributive education program?*

|| The results indicate that 76% of the graduates interviewed felt that the distributive education program prepared them from good to excellent for their first job, 41% felt that the distributive education program prepared them from good to excellent for their present job, 64% felt the classroom instruction was from valuable to very valuable, and 98% would recommend the marketing or distributive education

program to other students. Further, the data reveal that the most important contributions of the distributive education program are: (a) learning to get along with other people, which ranked highest, and (b) learning to be an effective worker, which ranked second.

Data derived from this objective indicate a conclusion that the classroom portion of the distributive education program at Sky View High School is adequate. However, responses show that problem areas exist in the curriculum. These areas include: career exploration, career planning, career guidance, and establishing a career objective.

7. What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the on-the-job (cooperative phase) of the distributive education program?

The data obtained from the graduate interviews indicate that 82% of the 50 graduates interviewed participated in the on-the-job (cooperative phase) portion of the distributive education program. Of those that did participate, 85% felt that this training was valuable to very valuable.

The conclusion to this objective must be that the on-the-job (cooperative phase) portion of the vocational program in question is an integral and valuable part of the graduates' training.

8. What opinions do the above graduates have concerning the value of the cocurricular organization, The Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA)?

The results of the interviews indicated that 90% of the graduates belonged to DECA. The totals also showed that of those that did participate in DECA, their participation was considered valuable to very

valuable. Of the DECA participants, 51.1% felt their participation to be somewhat valuable to valuable in relation to their vocational training.

The findings of the objective indicate that even though participation in DECA is high, the interviewees felt that DECA was somewhat valuable to their vocational training.

Recommendations

In reviewing the tabulated findings and conclusions of this report, the following recommendations are presented:

1. The researcher feels that with the employment and job stability among the graduates interviewed being good, the recommendation would be that the teacher/coordinators in the distributive education program at Sky View High School continue to emphasize "How to Get a Good Job" and "How to Keep a Job" as part of the course content.

2. With the relatively poor percentage of graduates that continue to study, train, and/or work in the distributive (marketing) field after graduation, the researcher feels that the following should be established as part of the distributive education program at Sky View High School.

- A. The feasibility of a two-year marketing program should be looked into by the administration. In this program, consideration should be made of scheduling problems encountered by students. A first-year marketing class should be considered that would be offered on a semester basis for tenth and eleventh grades. By offering this class on a semester basis, flexibility will be established whereby difficulty in scheduling can be eased. A full second year or advanced

marketing class should be offered as a follow-up of the first-year class. The emphasis of this class should be on the specialized courses that meet the needs of the career interests and objectives of each student.

B. Units in career exploration, career planning, career guidance, and establishing a career objective should be incorporated into the curriculum, preferably in the first-year class. Career education should be emphasized throughout the distributive education program.

C. Recruiting and selection of students cannot be over-emphasized. It is recommended that a recruiting program, which includes the students, former successful alumni, DECA, and the teacher/coordinators, be established where highest priority is given to building a successful and viable program. Recruitment of students should begin in the junior high school years. With a good recruiting program, the teacher/coordinators can control the caliber and selection of the students who will come into their program. A program such as this will help to increase the number of students who have career interests in the marketing field.

D. The teacher/coordinators should strive to involve all advanced marketing students in the cooperative phase of the program. Furthermore, since the cooperative method is apparently effective in the training of the students, other vocational fields at Sky View High should consider utilizing this method of instruction.

3. Administrators should take steps to expand career educational activities into all curricular areas within the school system.

4. The administration should look into the amount of career counseling that each student receives at Sky View High School.

5. The teacher/coordinators at Sky View High School should become personally involved in conducting a follow-up study of distributive education graduates on an annual basis to find areas of program improvement and change.

6. It is recommended that a community survey by the teacher/coordinators of Sky View High School be conducted to determine the needs of the community in the field of employment in distributive occupations.

7. The teacher/coordinators should consider initiating a more effective job placement service for those students who complete the distributive education program to insure that they are placed in jobs that relate to their vocational training.

LITERATURE CITED

- Best, John W. *Research in education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Coakley, Carroll B. *Distributive education: Teacher-coordinators. handbook*. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Crawford, Lucy C., & Meyer, Warren G. *Organization and administration of distributive education*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co., 1972.
- Drake, James Bob. *A follow-up study of 1971-1972 distributive occupation trainees from secondary vocational programs of Alabama*. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama: Occupational Research and Development Unit Department of Vocational and Adult Education School of Education (ED 108003), 1974.
- Furlong, Patrick A. *A follow-up study of Mound High School distributive education graduates (1967-1972)*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1974.
- Huffman, Harry. Evaluation responsibility: Criteria for evaluating business and office education. *National Business Education Yearbook*, No. 7. Washington, D.C.: National Business Education Association, 1969.
- Iliff, Kathryn M. The follow-up study in business education. *National Business Education Quarterly*, 1966-1967, 35, 16-18.
- McKinney, Floyd L., & Oglesby, Charles. *Developing and conducting follow-up studies of former students*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky, 1971.
- Meyer, Warren, Crawford, Lucy, & Klaurens, Mary K. *Coordination in cooperative vocational education*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co., 1975.
- Meyer, Warren, & Furtado, Lorraine T. A historical development of distributive education. *National Business Education Yearbook*, No. 14. Washington, D.C.: National Business Education Association, 1976.
- Micheletti, John. *A follow-up study of distributive education graduates of the Providence public high schools*. Kingston, Rhode Island: University of Rhode Island, 1973.

- Moss, Jerome, Jr. *The evaluation of occupational educational programs*. Technical Report No. 3. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1968.
- Mulhern, James. *A history of education*. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1959.
- Nelson, Edwin. Priorities for instructional strategies. *Distributive marketing education: Innovative instructional techniques in distributive education*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education Government Printing Office, 1973.
- Parr, Charles D. Out of school, out of work. *American Vocational Journal*, December, 1971, pp. 18-19.
- Stull, William A., & Winn, Charles. "Plus" - A new specialized approach to instruction in distributive education. *Utah State Business Educator*, 1975, 10, No. 1, 6-7.
- U.S. Office of Education. *Instructional program codes for distributive education*. Final draft for field review. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, May, 1977.
- Utah State Board of Education. *Vocational education management-delivery guide*. Revised by E. Charles Parker. Logan, Utah: Utah State University, 1976.
- Wilkinson, Donald Ray. *A comparison study of cooperative distributive education graduates with non-cooperative distributive education graduates on selected employment factors in the state of Iowa*. Laramie, Wyoming: University of Wyoming, 1974.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

SKY VIEW HIGH SCHOOL

Smithfield, Utah

Dear Graduate:

In the near future you will be contacted by Mr. Tom Broberg concerning your employment since leaving our school. I would like to request your cooperation by helping Mr. Broberg complete this study on our Distributive Education Program. It is designed to aid in improving our program in preparing students for the world of work. Your responses to the questions that will be asked of you will be of tremendous aid to us and the students now preparing for employment. Your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence.

Sincerely,

Mr. John A. Hansen,
Principal

JH/bas

Appendix B

SKY VIEW HIGH SCHOOL

Smithfield, Utah

GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME _____ DATE _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE _____ YEAR GRADUATED _____

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

1. What is your present employment status?

- A. Employed, full-time (35 or more hours per week).
 B. Employed, part-time (less than 35 hours per week).
 C. Not employed: Looking for work.
 D. Not employed: Not looking for work.
 E. Going to school full-time.

NAME OF EMPLOYER _____

POSITION _____

LOCATION _____

2. How many employers have you worked for since graduation?

- A. 1.
 B. 2.
 C. 3.
 D. 4 or more.
 E. Have not employed since graduation.

RELATED POST-SECONDARY SCHOOLING OR TRAINING

3. Are you presently studying or training in marketing or a related field?

- A. Yes.
 B. No.

4. What type of program are you attending? (Answer if you are attending or receiving any type of post-secondary training.)

- A. Two year college.
 B. Four year college or university.
 C. Private business school.
 D. Apprentice program.
 E. Adult vocational education class.
 F. Business or industry training program.
 G. Military training.
 H. Other (specify) _____.

5. If not pursuing further study or training in marketing, please indicate the reason.

- A. Never planned to work in that field.
 B. I do not like that type of work.
 C. Too little opportunity in the career field.
 D. Disliked studying and/or training in this field of work.
 E. Found another career field I liked better.

RELATED MARKETING EMPLOYMENT STATUS

6. Are you presently employed in a distributive or marketing occupation?

- A. Yes.
 B. No.

7. If not, what is the major reason for not pursuing marketing or distribution as a career?

- A. Never planned to work in that field.
 B. Tried, but unable to find a job in that field.
 C. Feel I did not learn enough in the marketing program.
 D. Pay was too low.
 E. I did not like that type of work.
 F. Too little opportunity in the career field.
 G. Disliked the working conditions.
 H. Found another career field I liked better.

8. Rate how well your marketing or distributive education program prepared you for your first job after graduation.

- A. Excellent.
- B. Good.
- C. Fair.
- D. Poor.
- E. Very poor.

9. Rate how well your marketing or distributive education program prepared you for your present job.

- A. Excellent.
- B. Good.
- C. Fair.
- D. Poor.
- E. Very poor.
- F. Still have my first job after graduation.

CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

10. Rate how valuable you thought the marketing or distributive education classroom instruction was to your vocational training.

- A. Very valuable.
- B. Valuable.
- C. Somewhat valuable.
- D. Of no value.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

11. Did you participate in the on-the-job training portion of your marketing or distributive education program?

- A. Yes.
- B. No.

12. If you did participate in the on-the-job training portion of your marketing program, rate how valuable the on-the-job training was to your vocational training.

- A. Very valuable.
- B. Valuable.
- C. Somewhat valuable.
- D. Of no value.

DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION CLUBS OF AMERICA

13. Did you belong to DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America)?

___ A. Yes.

___ B. No.

14. If you belonged to DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America), rate how valuable this was to your vocational training.

___ A. Very valuable.

___ B. Valuable.

___ C. Somewhat valuable.

___ D. Of no value.

15. Based on your total training experiences, would you recommend the marketing or distributive education program to other students?

___ A. Yes.

___ B. No.

16. What were the most important contributions of the marketing or distributive education program to you? (Rank in the order that you feel is the most important.)

___ A. Firmed up my career plans.

___ B. Identified personal strengths and weaknesses.

___ C. Decided whether to go to college.

___ D. Developed job skills that helped me get a good job.

___ E. Learned to get along with other people.

___ F. Learned to be an effective worker.

___ G. Developed confidence in my abilities.

___ H. Other (specify).

VITA

Thomas J. Broberg

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Plan "B" Report: A Follow-up Study of the Distributive Education
Graduates of Sky View High School (1972-1976)

Major Field: Business Education with emphasis in Distributive Educa-
tion

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Logan, Utah, October 11, 1942, son of
John H. Broberg and Jane Rasmussen Broberg; married LaDawn
Bateson September 27, 1969; two children--Nicole and Erika.

Education: Attended elementary school in Logan and Hyrum, Utah;
graduated from South Cache High School in 1960; received the
Bachelor of Science degree from Utah State University, with
a major in economics, in 1966; did graduate work in the
Department of Business Education, 1976-1978; completed
requirements for the Master of Science degree, in business
education with emphasis in distributive education, at Utah
State University in 1978.

Professional Experience: January 1967 to June 1974, officer in
the U.S. Air Force with the rank of Captain. Duties included
being a Squadron Pilot, Missile Combat Crew Commander, Chief
of Central Base Funds. June 1974 to March 1976, auto parts
salesman. March 1976 to June 1977, teaching assistantship/
lectureship in the Department of Business Education, Utah
State University, and teacher/coordinator Cache Valley Mall
Marketing Program through Bridgerland Area Vocational Center.
August 1977 to present, teacher/coordinator of marketing at
Bonneville High School, Ogden, Utah.