

Student Work

7-1-1974

**A distributive education follow-up study of the June, 1970
graduates of the Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska**

Joseph A. Nebel
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Nebel, Joseph A., "A distributive education follow-up study of the June, 1970 graduates of the Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska" (1974). *Student Work*. 1200.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/1200>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



A DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE JUNE, 1970
GRADUATES OF THE OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA

A Field Project
Presented to the
Department of Educational Administration
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist in Education

by
Joseph A. Nebel
July, 1974

9371/66

UMI Number: EP73440

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73440

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College of the University
of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Specialist in Education.

Graduate Committee:

Kirk E. Urylow EDAD
Name Department

Leta F. Holley

Darrell Kellams EdAd
Chairman

7-16-'74
Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to his committee members: Professors Leta F. Holley, Darrell Kellams, and Kirk Naylor, as well as Professor George Rachford, for their constructive criticism and helpful guidance;

And to Miss Mildred C. Blair, retired supervisor of Business and Distributive Education, and Mr. James Nebel, supervisor of Business and Distributive Education, Omaha Public Schools, for their helpful suggestions and constructive criticisms.

J. A. N.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
The Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Main Hypothesis	2
Importance of the Study	2
Limitations of the Study	3
Method of Study	3
Definitions of Terms Used	4
Cooperative Distributive Education	4
Cooperative Trainees	4
Cooperative Vocational Education Programs	4
Distribution	5
Distributive Education--D. E.	5
Distributive Education Clubs of America--DECA	5
Distributive Education Graduates	5
Distributive Occupations	5
Homemaker	6
On-the-Job Training	6
Teacher-Coordinator	6
Unemployed	6
Vocational Education	6
Vocational Guidance	6
II. SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE	7

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	16
Employment Related	16
Number of Respondents	16
Occupational Status	16
Types of Businesses	19
Number of Employees at Location	19
Monthly Wages	22
Methods Used in Securing Present Jobs	22
Level of Formal Education Necessary for Present Job	26
Promotions and Job Changes	26
Main Reasons for Changing Jobs	26
School Related	29
Education or Training Beyond High School	29
Units of Study in Distributive Education--First Semester--Junior Year	31
Units of Study in Distributive Education--Second Semester--Junior Year	31
Units of Study in Senior Year of Distributive Education	36
Attendance	40
High School Training in Distributive Education and First Full-Time Job	40
On-the-Job Training	44
Instructional Materials	44
Individual Projects	44
DECA--An Integral Part of the Distributive Education Program	47

CHAPTER	PAGE
III.	Evaluation of High School Business Education Courses 50
	Business Education Courses Offered in High School
	Which Respondents Wish They Had Taken 50
	Business Education Courses Not Offered Which Respond-
	ents Wish They Could Have Taken 53
	Suggestions for the Improvement of the Distributive
	Education Program 54
IV.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 57
	Summary 57
	Conclusions 61
	Recommendations 63
	BIBLIOGRAPHY 65
	APPENDIX 71

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
<p>I. Number and Percent of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates Who Returned Questionnaire, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, December, 1973</p>	17
<p>II. Current Full-Time Occupational Status of the June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates Participating in Follow-Up Study, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, December, 1973</p>	18
<p>III. Number and Percentage of Part-Time and Full-Time Jobs Currently Held in Field Trained, in Related Field, and in Non-Related Field by 87 June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates Who Participated in Follow-Up Study, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, December, 1973 . . .</p>	20
<p>IV. Types of Businesses and Number and Percentage of 87 June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates Working in Respective Type of Business and Participating in Follow-Up Study, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, December, 1973</p>	21
<p>V. Number and Percent of Responses of 87 June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha Nebraska, to the Statement, "Check the Approximate Number of Employees in Your Company at the Location Where You Work."</p>	23

TABLE

PAGE

VI.	Monthly Wage Ranges and Number and Percentage of 87 June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates Earning in Respective Wage Range and Participating in Follow-Up Study, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, December, 1973	24
VII.	Methods Used in Securing Present Jobs by 87 June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates Who Participated in Follow-Up Study, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, December, 1973	25
VIII.	Levels of Formal Education Necessary in Securing Present Jobs by 87 June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates Who Participated in Follow-Up Study, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, December, 1973	27
IX.	Number and Percent of Responses of 73 June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, to the Question, "How Many Times Have You Changed Jobs Since Being Graduated from High School?"	28
X.	Number and Percent of Responses of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, to the Question, "If You Have Changed Jobs Since Being Graduated, What Were Your Main Reasons for Doing So?"	30
XI.	Number and Percent of Responses of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High School, Omaha, Nebraska, to the Statement, "Check the Type of Education (Training), if Any, You Have Received Beyond High School."	32

TABLE	PAGE
<p>XII. Number and Percent of Responses of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, to the Statement, "Of the Following Units Studied in Your First Semester (Junior Year) of Distributive Education, Indicate by 1, 2, 3, 4 the Order of Helpfulness."</p>	33
<p>XIII. Number and Percent of Responses of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, to the Question, "Of the Following Units Studied in Your First Semester (Junior Year) of Distributive Education, on Which, if Any, Should Have Less or Additional Time Been Spent?"</p>	34
<p>XIV. Number and Percent of Responses of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, to the Statement, "Of the Following Units Studied in Your Second Semester (Junior Year) of Distributive Education, Indicate by 1, 2, 3, 4 Etc. the Order of Helpfulness."</p>	35
<p>XV. Number and Percent of Responses of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha Nebraska, to the Question, "Of the Following Units Studied in Your Second Semester (Junior Year) of Distributive Education, on Which, if Any, Should Have Less or Additional Time Been Spent?"</p>	37
<p>XVI. Number and Percent of Responses of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha,</p>	

TABLE	PAGE
Nebraska, to the Statement, "Of the Following Units Studied in Your Senior Year of Distributive Education, Indicate by 1, 2, 3, Etc. the Order of Helpfulness."	38
XVII. Number and Percent of Responses of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, to the Question, "Of the Following Units Studied in Your Senior Year of Distributive Education, on Which, if Any, Should Have Less or Additional Time Been Spent?"	41
XVIII. Number and Percent of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, Responding to the Statement, "The Teachers Should Stress the Importance of Attendance at School and/or on the Job."	42
XIX. Number and Percent of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, Responding to the Statement, "Your High School Training in Distributive Education Adequately Prepared You for Your First Full-Time Job."	43
XX. Number and Percent of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, Responding to the Statement, "On-the-Job Training (Cooperative Distributive Education) Helped 'Bridge the Gap' between School and Your First Full-Time Job."	45
XXI. Number and Percent of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska,	

TABLE	PAGE
Responding to the Statement, "The Instructional Materials Used in Your Distributive Education Classes Were up to Date and Helpful."	46
XXII. Number and Percent of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, Responding to the Statement, "Additional Emphasis Should be Placed on Individual Projects Relating to on-the-Job Training and the Student's Career Objectives."	48
XXIII. Number and Percent of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, Responding to the Statement, "In Your Opinion, DECA is a Very Integral Part of the Distributive Education Program."	49
XXIV. Number and Percent of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, Responding to the Question, "Which Business Education Courses Taken in High School Were Most Helpful to You?" Indicate by 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Etc. the Order of Helpfulness.	51
XXV. Number and Percent of Responses of June, 1970, Distributive Education Graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, to the Question, "Of the Business Courses Offered in High School, Which Do You Wish You Had Taken?"	52

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

An essential factor in the evaluation of the effectiveness of a distributive education curriculum is a determination of what is being done in the area of distribution and of what the graduates do after they leave the distributive education curriculum.

No longer can distributive educators depend on what they think is being done or on what was done at some time in the past. A major objective of distributive education is the preparation of students for gainful employment in the area of distribution in business, and this preparation is greatly affected by changes that occur in the business world.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem. The main purpose of this investigation was to conduct a follow-up study of the distributive education students who were graduated in June, 1970, from six Omaha, Nebraska, Public High Schools--Benson, Burke, Central, North, South, and Technical--in order to determine:

1. If the curriculum is designed to meet the current and future needs of the students and the community.
2. Current occupational status of graduates.
3. The number of part-time and full-time jobs held in the field in which trained, in a related field, or in a non-related field.
4. Methods used in securing present jobs.

5. The number of jobs held since being graduated and the main reasons for changing jobs.
6. The level of formal education necessary for entry into specific occupation.
7. The approximate monthly wage range of each graduate who is working and the approximate number of employees in their respective company at the location where each graduate works.
8. The number of graduates who are receiving or have received post-high school training and the types of institutions represented.
9. The adequacy of the number and types of business education courses offered.

Main Hypothesis. The majority of the June, 1970, distributive education graduates are employed directly or indirectly in an area of distribution for which they received high school training.

Importance of the Study. It is generally recognized among distributive educators that a follow-up of distributive education graduates is an integral part of the program. Such a study can be extremely beneficial in assessing the strengths, the weaknesses, and the changes that might be indicated in this phase of the school's curriculum.

Although many studies have been completed in the field of distributive education, the number of formal studies completed to determine fully all of what the student does after he leaves the high school environment appears to be somewhat limited.

At the present time, an annual follow-up of graduates is required for all federally reimbursed vocational programs. However, Crawford and Meyer are of the opinion:

that follow-up studies of graduates of 3, 5, and 10 years are of critical importance, because the distributive education

graduate would have been in the labor market long enough to accept additional responsibilities and/or to continue his education.¹

This line of thinking coincides with that of a previous assistant superintendent in charge of vocational education and the supervisor of business and distributive education, Omaha Public Schools. Both expressed a keen interest in a three-year study, as it will aid in establishing a format for future follow-up studies, which will be taken at periodic intervals.

Limitations of the Study. This study was limited to 229 students who, in their senior year, were enrolled in the distributive education program and were graduated in June, 1970, from six Omaha, Nebraska, Public High Schools--Benson, Burke, Central, North, South, and Technical. It should be noted that the program was just initiated at Central during the 1969-1970 school year.

Method of Study. The questionnaire and a cover letter, used to explain the purposes and importance of the study, (see appendix) were sent to 229 graduates by first-class mail on December 10, 1973.

A follow-up letter (see appendix) and another copy of the questionnaire were mailed on December 28, 1973, to those who did not respond to the first request.

Of the 229 questionnaires sent in the first mailing, 50 were returned with the following notations:

28--"Addressee Unknown"

¹Lucy C. Crawford and Warren G. Meyer, Organization and Administration of Distributive Education (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972), pp. 320-321.

12--"Moved, Not Forwardable"

6--"Moved, Left No Address"

2--"No Such Number"

2--"Deceased"

During the months of January, February, and March, telephone calls were made to those who did not respond to the second request. However, many of the telephone numbers and addresses had changed, which made contact very difficult. Consequently, the number of graduates contacted by telephone was minimal. Since it was deemed that a sufficient number of graduates had responded in order to make a valid study, no further attempt was made to contact those who did not respond.

Definitions of Terms Used

Cooperative Distributive Education. This term shall refer to a program whereby students, who are seniors and are enrolled in distributive education, spend a minimum of 15 hours a week in supervised, related on-the-job training in cooperating local businesses. Part-time occupational experiences may be in such areas as: banking, communications, consumer services, finance, real estate, retailing, transportation, and wholesaling.

Cooperative Trainees. This term shall refer to students who are seniors, are enrolled in a cooperative vocational education program, and spend a minimum of 15 hours a week in supervised, related on-the-job training in cooperating local businesses.

Cooperative Vocational Education Programs. This term shall refer to programs whereby students, who are seniors and are enrolled in

agri-business education, distributive education, or office education, spend a minimum of 15 hours a week in supervised, related on-the-job training in cooperating local businesses.

Distribution. This term shall refer to "everything that happens to a product from the time it leaves the producer or manufacturer until it reaches the ultimate consumer."²

Distributive Education--D. E. This term shall refer to:

. . . 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. . . offers instruction in marketing, merchandising, related management, and personal development.³

Distributive Education Clubs of America--DECA. This term shall refer to "a youth organization that provides a program of activities which complements and enriches distributive curriculums."⁴

Distributive Education Graduates. This term shall refer to graduates who were enrolled in a distributive education course during their senior year.

Distributive Occupations. This term shall refer to workers who are "engaged primarily in the marketing or merchandising of goods and services, at both management and non-management levels."⁵

²Ibid., p. 3.

³Ibid., p. 2.

⁴Ibid., p. 11.

⁵Ibid., p. 4.

Homemaker. This term shall refer to graduates who are full-time homemakers and have no outside employment.

On-the-Job Training. This term shall have the same meaning as cooperative distributive education.

Teacher-Coordinator. This term shall refer to a member of the professional staff who teaches distributive education to students preparing for employment, coordinates classroom instruction with on-the-job training, and acts as chapter advisor of DECA activities.

Unemployed. This term shall refer to graduates who are available for work but are not currently employed.

Vocational Education. This term shall refer to "that part of an educational experience which has a primary purpose of equipping persons for useful employment in semi-skilled, skilled, technical, and paraprofessional occupations."⁶

Vocational Guidance. This term shall refer to "the process of assisting individuals to understand their capabilities and interests, choose a vocation, and prepare for, enter, and make progress in it."⁷

⁶Laymen's Glossary of Vocational Education Terms (Cleveland: The Manpower Planning and Development Commission, The Welfare Federation of Cleveland, 1969), p. 6.

⁷Ibid., p. 8.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

It is estimated that 75 percent of American youth leave the formal school setting to enter the world of work without having attained a baccalaureate degree. It is very important to realize that whatever the level of school at which the transition from school to work occurs, the youth's readiness and opportunity to find satisfactory employment is necessary to the maintaining of his self-respect and dignity as a person.¹

In addition, it has been frequently emphasized that the ability of a society to afford economic security to people with varying levels of educational attainment, occupational attainment, and experience lies near the heart of sustaining a safe and sound society.²

With this in mind, many educational planners have been and are examining carefully the basic relationship of school programs to the needs of all individuals for occupational preparation, as well as to the nature of the preparation which schools should and can provide.

J. Kenneth Little points out that more and more administrators are confronted with such questions as:

- a) What happens to the young men and women who try to find work instead of continuing school beyond graduation?
- b) Are there important differences between the job-finding experiences of graduates of vocational education programs

¹J. Kenneth Little, Review and Synthesis of Research on the Placement and Follow-Up of Vocational Education Students, ERIC Clearinghouse, No. 49 (Columbus: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, 1970), p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 4.

and the experiences of students who graduate without such preparation?

- c) Does the school program, teaching staff, and counseling service assist youth who go to work as effectively as it assists youth who go to college?³

In order to ascertain adequate answers to the above questions, as well as the effectiveness of the educational curriculum, it would be advantageous to conduct a thorough follow-up study. Illiff reflects this thinking when she states:

. . . One widely used means of securing data for using in evaluating the educational program is that of the follow-up study. . . The follow-up study is a direct method by which an institution may evaluate the effectiveness of its educational program through its product, the graduate.⁴

Obviously, much knowledge can be gained from a follow-up study, if carefully planned, so as to enable administrators and educators to improve the educational program to serve better former and future graduates.

In this age of accountability, no longer can educators assume that the high school is not responsible for the student after he is graduated.

In 1968, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare said:

Effective occupational preparation is impossible if the school feels that its obligation ends when the student graduates. The school, therefore, must work with employers to build a bridge between school and work. Placing the student on a job and following up his successes and failures provides the best possible information to the school on its own strengths and weaknesses. . .⁵

³Ibid., p. 3.

⁴Kathryn M. Illiff, "The Follow-Up in Business Education," National Business Education Quarterly, XXXV (December, 1966), p. 35.

⁵M. D. Miller and W. E. Budke, Job Placement and Follow-Up of Secondary School Vocational Education Students, ERIC Reports, No. 32 (Washington, D. C.: National Center for Educational Communication--DHEW/OE--1970), p. 5, citing U. S. Congress, 1968.

As early as 1963, the U. S. Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education requested national data in order to analyze and appraise vocational placement; and it is interesting to note that as late as 1968, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare found that:

Most schools did not provide efficient vocational placement services, and few schools had organized programs for systematic follow-up of students after graduation or placement.⁶

Consequently, it was the committee's recommendation that the definition of VOCATIONAL EDUCATION be expanded to include responsibility for vocational student follow-up.⁷ Miller and Budke concur with this recommendation as they feel the "responsibility for vocational graduate follow-up tends to encourage schools to utilize the information in evaluating and upgrading their vocational programs."⁸

The 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, Section 102.8, have delegated the responsibility for student follow-up to the guidance and counseling services. This is brought out in Item 5, which states that: "Vocational guidance and counseling services shall be designed to conduct follow-up procedures to determine the effectiveness of the vocational instruction and guidance program."⁹

Miller and Budke also remark that "current guidelines for state plans for vocational education require information about comprehensive vocational education follow-up studies of local programs."¹⁰

⁶Ibid., p. 18.

⁷Ibid., p. 18.

⁸Ibid., p. 18.

⁹Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 19.

In general, the frequency and timing of follow-up studies are determined by the purposes for collecting the data and the financial resources available. It is generally suggested that school systems collect follow-up data at least twice after the students are graduated. The primary purpose of the first follow-up should be to ascertain the initial placement of each graduate. The purpose of the second follow-up should include a measurement of job adjustment, adequacy of skill development, and worker mobility.¹¹

It is noted that state education agencies require that information be gathered three months after the students are graduated. This information is needed by the agencies for their reports to the federal government. The main advantage of the three-month follow-up is that it is usually easier to locate the recent graduates. However, the length of time that the graduates may have been on the job is too short to measure essential worker competency.¹²

Student follow-up surveys conducted three years or more after graduation are of particular value to researchers in that they help to determine job histories, worker mobility, and worker adjustment patterns. Also, students who have been graduated for at least three years are in a better position to assess their education and training needs as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the high school instructional programs.¹³

In addition, a three-year follow-up would include graduates of two-year post-secondary education programs--junior and community colleges, technical colleges and institutes--and graduates who may have taken short

¹¹Ibid., p. 24.

¹²Ibid., p. 24.

¹³Ibid., pp. 24-25.

courses. At the end of three years, these graduates will generally have completed their studies and have been employed for approximately one year.¹⁴

It is generally recognized among distributive educators that a follow-up of distributive education graduates is, indeed, an integral part of the program. Most of them will concur with the thinking that the best information pertaining to the adequacy of the distributive education program probably comes from the follow-up of students who are placed on jobs through the cooperative program. It seems logical that these students should be in a good position to provide information to the school about the program's strengths and limitations as well as to identify additional cooperative student training needs.

Although many studies have been completed in the field of distributive education, the number of formal studies completed to substantiate fully all of what the student does after he leaves the high school environment appears to be somewhat limited. The following literature reviews several follow-up studies pertaining to high school graduates of the cooperative distributive education program.

In 1963, Joseph C. Hecht¹⁵ conducted a follow-up study of the distributive education graduates from Kingston, Newburgh, and Poughkeepsie, New York, secondary schools. The main purposes of his study were to ascertain why these graduates selected career training in distributive education, whether a substantial number remained in the field, and what

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 24-25.

¹⁵Joseph C. Hecht, "A Follow-Up Study of High School Graduates of Three Retailing Programs" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1963).

their evaluation of the program was after they obtained store experience. Questionnaires were mailed to 650 graduates of the classes of 1953-1957. He received replies from 213.

Major findings reported in this study revealed that:

1. Forty-six percent of the respondents said that the training aided them to advance more rapidly in their chosen careers.
2. The respondents felt that they knew more than other part-time workers, than others doing similar jobs, and that they knew more than was expected of them.
3. Responses showed that 10 percent of the respondents were encouraged to enroll in the distributive education program by guidance counselors while another 10 percent were encouraged by distributive education teachers.
4. General and social units rather than specific retailing units were judged by graduates to be most useful. These units were: How to Get Along with Others, How to be Interviewed for a Job; How to Dress Correctly, Developing Good Habits, and Public Relations. Only the Selling Techniques unit was included in the first six as valuable to the graduates.
5. Respondents indicated that they chose distributive education for vocational reasons and because the field offered advancement and opportunities.
6. In spite of their vocational motivation, only 13 percent remained in the field from one to three years after graduation.
7. The possibility to earn credit toward graduation as well as money stimulated them to enroll in distributive education training.
8. Respondents felt that more coverage and time should be given in the classroom to: Salesmanship, Display Techniques, and Buying and Advertising.
9. Fifty percent of the respondents left the field of retailing before six months and thus were not able to decide whether opportunities existed. They felt that opportunities for advancement were inadequate, beginning wages were low, and working hours long.
10. The fields most graduates entered upon leaving distributive careers in order of incidence were: to

become a housewife, self-employed, and manufacturing.
(He did not mention types of self-employment.)

Hecht recommended that distributive education teachers should do a better job of contacting prospective students personally to explain the program to them. He also suggested a further study to determine whether poor placement on the job or improper orientation by both teachers and store employers could be the motivating factors responsible for the changing of vocational goals upon completion of program. Among his other recommendations are: Graduates should give retailing careers a fair chance before condemning them, and teacher-coordinators and employer trainers should evaluate a student trainee early in the training period and inform him of his possibilities for success in retailing.

A study by Lawrence¹⁶ was made in 1973 to ascertain primarily the extent to which Louisiana high school graduates who had participated in cooperative vocational education programs found and entered jobs in the field for which they were trained. He obtained responses from 1,207 cooperative vocational education trainees, including many cooperative distributive education trainees, who had been out of high school one year.

Lawrence found that:

1. Cooperative trainees find and enter jobs soon after high school graduation, primarily within their home towns or communities, and generally in the field for which they received training. Many trainees continue to work for their cooperative employer after graduation.
2. There is a wide variation in wages received by cooperative trainees. Male trainees receive significantly higher weekly wages than do females.

¹⁶Layle Duane Lawrence, "Employment and Educational Experiences of Louisiana Cooperative Vocational Education Participants" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1973).

3. Locating suitable job openings is the problem area of greatest difficulty faced by participants during their first year out of high school. Most participants secure their jobs through informal methods.
4. Cooperative trainees are generally satisfied with all aspects of their jobs except for pay and promotional opportunities.
5. Respondents held favorable opinions of their high school vocational training and felt they were well prepared for their jobs.
6. Participants generally agree that the school should provide more assistance in job placement of graduates and that more individualized instruction should be given in school pertaining to the trainee's particular job.
7. Participation in a cooperative vocational education program does not prevent trainees from furthering their education in post-high school institutions.

During the past year, Domian¹⁷ conducted a simple survey to attempt to ascertain primarily the answers to two questions:

1. Is the distributive education graduate better prepared to face the demands of contemporary society than he would have been if he had not taken the program?
2. Has the distributive education graduate been able to cope with contemporary society?

Domian mailed questionnaires to 100 distributive education graduates of Fox High School in Arnold, Missouri, and obtained a response rate of 50 percent from the three classes--1971, 10; 1972, 17; and 1973, 23. Thirty-two (64 percent) responded that distributive education better prepared them for their career choice; and 23 (46 percent) indicated that class instruction, on-the-job training, and DECA were very beneficial to them. All of the respondents said that they would recommend the program to a future Fox High student and that they would take distributive education courses again if they were back in high school.

¹⁷Judi Domian, "Well-Trained D. E. Students Can Cope," American Vocational Journal, XXXIX (March, 1974), pp. 45-47.

In addition, Domian found out that 20 (40 percent) of the 50 respondents are presently working in distributive occupations, 5 (10 percent) are in trade occupations, 6 (12 percent) are in office occupations, 9 (18 percent) are in advanced schooling, 2 (4 percent) are in the armed forces, and 8 (16 percent) are not employed.

It is particularly interesting to note that 35 (70 percent) of the respondents feel that, because of their background in distributive education, they are better prepared to meet their future than are their peers. The fact that 28 (56 percent) of the participants replied that distributive education has inspired them to pursue their education or occupation to a higher level seems to reinforce Lawrence's finding that participation in a cooperative education program does not prevent trainees from furthering their education in post-high school institutions.¹⁸

Based on the above responses, it would appear that distributive education has proven very beneficial to the majority of the respondents in helping them to cope with contemporary society.

¹⁸Lawrence, op. cit.

CHAPTER III

INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

This chapter presents an analysis of data relative to a follow-up study of the distributive education students who were graduated in June, 1970, from six Omaha, Nebraska, Public High Schools--Benson, Burke, Central, North, South, and Technical. The mailed questionnaire was the major method of investigation utilized in this study.

Employment Related

Number of Respondents. The data in Table I show the names of the schools and the number and percent of June, 1970, distributive education graduates who returned the questionnaire.

Responses were obtained from 101 of 229 distributive education graduates--59 females and 42 males--representing a 44.1 percent return. The lowest rate of return came from Technical, with only 11 (21.2 percent) of the graduates returning the questionnaire. In contrast, the highest return came from Burke, with 14 (63.6 percent) responding. Of the 37 distributive education graduates of Benson in June, 1970, 23 (62.2 percent) responded, while the graduates of South returned 16 (57.1 percent). Twenty-six (42.6 percent) of the 61 distributive education graduates of North responded, and only 11 (37.9 percent) of the 29 distributive education graduates of Central responded.

Occupational Status. Table II denotes statistics pertaining to the occupational status of the distributive education graduates reporting.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION
GRADUATES WHO RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRE
OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS
OMAHA, NEBRASKA
DECEMBER, 1973

School	Number of Graduates	Number Responding	Percent
Benson	37	23	62.2
Burke	22	14	63.6
Central	29	11	37.9
North	61	26	42.6
South	28	16	57.1
Technical	52	11	21.2
Totals	229	101	44.1

TABLE II

CURRENT FULL-TIME OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF THE JUNE, 1970
 DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES PARTICIPATING IN FOLLOW-UP STUDY
 OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA
 DECEMBER, 1973

School	Number Reporting	Student		Employed		Unemployed		Homemaker		Military Service	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Benson	23	0	0	23	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burke	14	0	0	13	92.9	1	7.1	0	0	0	0
Central	11	0	0	7	63.6	0	0	1	9.1	3	27.3
North	26	2	7.7	20	77.0	1	3.8	1	3.8	2	7.7
South	16	0	0	13	81.2	0	0	2	12.5	1	6.3
Technical	11	0	0	11	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	101	2	2.0	87	86.0	2	2.0	4	4.0	6	6.0

Of the 101 respondents, 2 (2.0 percent) are full-time students, while 87 (86.0 percent) are employees. In addition, 2 (2.0 percent) are not employed, 4 (4.0 percent) are homemakers, and 6 (6.0 percent) are in military service. Of the 87 who are employees, 16 are working part time and 71 are working full time.

Data pertaining to the number and percent of part-time and full-time jobs currently held by the 87 respondents are contained in Table III. Of special significance is the fact that 51 (58.6 percent) are holding jobs for which they received high school training. Twenty-six (29.9 percent) are holding jobs in a related field, whereas only 10 (11.5 percent) are holding jobs in a non-related field.

Types of Businesses. Each respondent was asked to identify the type of business where he is employed. Table IV shows the total number and percent of the graduates employed in each of the respective types of businesses. It is noted that service and retail sales are the most frequently represented, with 39 (44.8 percent) engaged in a service type business and 36 (41.3 percent) engaged in retail sales of some type.

The wholesale business is the next most commonly represented, with 6 (6.9 percent) of the graduates working in that category. Two (2.3 percent) are employed in manufacturing, followed by one each in education and government; and only 2 (2.3 percent) are involved in construction.

Number of Employees at Location. In this study, 19 (21.8 percent) of the 87 employed respondents indicated that the number of employees at the location where they work falls into the 1-10 range. Nineteen (21.8 percent) work for companies that employ from 11-50 people, followed by 15 each (17.3 percent) for companies that employ from 51-150 and 11-50. The

TABLE III

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME JOBS CURRENTLY HELD IN FIELD TRAINED, IN RELATED FIELD, AND NON-RELATED FIELD BY 87 JUNE, 1970 DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES WHO PARTICIPATED IN FOLLOW-UP STUDY
 OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA
 DECEMBER, 1973

Field	Number	Percent
Jobs Held in Field Trained	51	58.6
Jobs Held in Related Field	26	29.9
Jobs Held in Non-Related Field	10	11.5
Totals	87	100.0

TABLE IV

TYPES OF BUSINESSES AND NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF 87 JUNE, 1970,
 DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES WORKING IN RESPECTIVE TYPE OF BUSINESS
 AND PARTICIPATING IN FOLLOW-UP STUDY
 OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA
 DECEMBER, 1973

Type of Business	Number	Percent
Education	1	1.2
Government	1	1.2
Manufacturing	2	2.3
Sales (Retail)	36	41.3
Sales (Wholesale)	6	6.9
Service	39	44.8
Other	2	2.3
Totals	87	100.0

number of respondents who work for companies that employ over 500 at respective locations is 19 or 21.8 percent, and the range is from 501 to 3,000 employees. These data are shown in Table V.

Monthly Wages. The wage range of the employed respondents is presented in Table VI. A wide range of monthly wages was found in this study, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100. Twelve of the graduates (13.8 percent) fall into the "other" category. Of this number, 7 are earning between \$735 and \$1,100. The remaining 5 are part-time employees and are making from \$100 to \$235 per month.

Fifteen each (17.2 percent) are earning in the \$250-299 and \$400-449 ranges. Twelve (13.8 percent) reported receiving wages from \$350-399, followed by 10 (11.5 percent) in the \$300-349 bracket and 9 (10.3 percent) in the \$450-499 bracket. In addition, 7 (8.1 percent) are earning from \$500-549, followed by 2 each in the \$550-599 and \$600-649 brackets. There are only 3 (3.5 percent) earning from \$650-699.

Methods Used in Securing Present Jobs. Table VII denotes data pertaining to methods employed in securing present jobs. Of the 87 participants working full time or part time, 32 (36.8 percent) obtained their jobs through friends and/or relatives, 2 (2.3 percent) through the state employment agency, and 6 (6.9 percent) through private employment agencies. The school assisted 9 (10.3 percent) of the graduates in locating jobs, whereas the newspapers assisted 17 (19.6 percent); and 21 (24.1 percent) secured present employment through self-contacts and other means. Among "other means" include a union and placement offices at beauty, business, and four-year colleges, with each office securing employment for one.

TABLE V

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF 87 JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA TO THE STATEMENT, "CHECK THE APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN YOUR COMPANY AT THE LOCATION WHERE YOU WORK."

Employee Range	Number	Percent
1-10	19	21.8
11-50	19	21.8
51-150	15	17.3
151-500	15	17.3
Over 500	19	21.8
Totals	87	99.8*

*Percent Does Not Equal 100 Because of Rounding--

TABLE VI

MONTHLY WAGE RANGES AND NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF 87 JUNE, 1970,
 DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES EARNING IN RESPECTIVE WAGE RANGE
 AND PARTICIPATING IN FOLLOW-UP STUDY
 OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA
 DECEMBER, 1973

Monthly Wage Range	Number	Percent
\$250-299	15	17.2
300-349	10	11.5
350-399	12	13.8
400-449	15	17.2
450-499	9	10.3
500-549	7	8.1
550-599	2	2.3
600-649	2	2.3
650-699	3	3.5
Other	12	13.8
Totals	87	100.0

TABLE VII

METHODS USED IN SECURING PRESENT JOBS BY 87 JUNE, 1970
 DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES WHO
 PARTICIPATED IN FOLLOW-UP STUDY
 OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA
 DECEMBER, 1973

Method	Number	Percent
Friend(s) and/or Relative(s)	32	36.8
State Employment Agency	2	2.3
Private Employment Agency	6	6.9
School--Counselor or D. E. Coordinator	9	10.3
Newspaper	17	19.6
Self-Contact and Other	21	24.1
Totals	87	100.0

Level of Formal Education Necessary for Present Job. In order to secure their present jobs, 73 (83.9 percent) of the 87 respondents said that high school was the minimum level of education required. Five (5.7 percent) attended a business school in order to meet the prerequisites for their respective jobs, and the same also applies to 3 (3.4 percent) who attended a technical college. One participant (1.2 percent) is in his fourth year of college and is working full time in the accounting field. Five (5.8 percent) fall into "other" category. Of these, 2 indicated that a high school education and beyond were not necessary for their types of employment; and, of the remaining, 2 obtained beauty school training and 1 is a nurse. These data are contained in Table VIII.

Promotions and Job Changes. Thirty-eight stated that they received a promotion to a higher paying job with their respective company, and 20 stated they did not receive an advancement or promotion with their present company.

In Table IX are data about the 73 replies to the question, "How many times have you changed jobs since being graduated from high school?" Of these, 20 (27.4 percent) have each held 1 job, 23 (31.5 percent) have each held 2, 2 (2.7 percent) have each held 4, and 2 (2.7 percent) have each held 5. The highest number of jobs held was 20, which was reported by 1 respondent (1.4 percent), followed by 1 participant who held 8 jobs and 1 (1.4 percent) who held 6.

Main Reasons for Changing Jobs. There were 187 responses received from the question, "If you have changed jobs since being graduated, what were your main reasons for doing so?" (It is necessary to keep in mind that the respondent could have checked more than one reason.)

TABLE VIII

LEVELS OF FORMAL EDUCATION NECESSARY IN SECURING PRESENT
 JOBS BY 87 JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES WHO
 PARTICIPATED IN FOLLOW-UP STUDY, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS,
 OMAHA, NEBRASKA
 DECEMBER, 1973

Level of Formal Education	Number	Percent
High School	73	83.9
Business School	5	5.7
Technical College	3	3.4
Two-Year College	0	0
Four-Year College	1	1.2
Other	5	5.8
Totals	87	100.0

TABLE IX

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF 73 JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE
EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA,
NEBRASKA, TO THE QUESTION, "HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU
CHANGED JOBS SINCE BEING GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL?"

Number of Responses	Percent	Number of Times Changed Jobs
20	27.4	1
23	31.5	2
2	2.7	4
2	2.7	5
1	1.4	6
1	1.4	8
1	1.4	20
73	100.0	--

As shown in Table X, better pay and better working conditions appear to be among the most common reasons for changing jobs, as 75 (40.1 percent) indicated better pay, while 38 (20.3 percent) replied better working conditions. The next most popular reason for changing jobs is boredom, followed by poor schedule--hours, with 22 (11.7 percent) indicating boredom and 14 (7.5 percent) indicating poor schedule--hours.

It is interesting to note that only 1 (.5 percent) gave personality conflict as a factor for changing jobs. Among the other reasons are: family responsibilities, 6 (3.2 percent); full-time education, 4 (2.1 percent); illness, 3 (1.6 percent); marriage, 8 (4.3 percent); moved, 11 (5.9 percent); and transportation, 4 (2.1 percent). Under "other," 1 (.5 percent) changed jobs because of the store going out of business.

School Related

Education or Training Beyond High School. Only 56 responses were received to the statement, "Check the type of education (training), if any, you have received beyond high school." Of the 25 (44.6 percent) who checked four-year college, only 2 are full-time students. Twelve (21.4 percent) have received in-service training, 7 (12.5 percent) have attended a technical college, and 6 (10.8 percent) have attended business college. Only 2 (3.6 percent) attended a two-year college, while 4 (7.1 percent) received some "other" type of training. Of this number, 2 received beauty school training, 1 received nurse's training, and 1 was in the Christian Brotherhood for eight months.

The length of attendance at a four-year college ranges from one semester to 3½ years, whereas the length of attendance at business college ranges from one semester to one year; and the duration of the in-service training

TABLE X

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, TO THE QUESTION, "IF YOU HAVE CHANGED JOBS SINCE BEING GRADUATED, WHAT WERE YOUR MAIN REASONS FOR DOING SO?"

Reason	Number of Responses	Percent
Better Pay	75	40.1
Better Working Conditions	38	20.3
Boredom	22	11.7
Family Responsibilities	6	3.2
Full-Time Education	4	2.1
Illness	3	1.6
Marriage	8	4.3
Moved	11	5.9
Personality Conflict	1	.5
Poor Schedule--Hours	14	7.5
Transportation	4	2.1
Other	1	.5
Totals	187	99.8*

*Percent Does Not Equal 100 Because of Rounding--

was from one week to one year. The remainder did not indicate anything under "length of attendance." These data are contained in Table XI.

Units of Study in Distributive Education--First Semester--Junior Year. Special skills in selling appears to be the most helpful unit studied in distributive education during the first semester of the junior year. Thirty-three of the 77 respondents gave it a high rating of 1. These data, along with other statistical data, are contained in Table XII.

The least helpful unit studied is inventory control, with 28 (38.8 percent) of the 72 respondents giving it the low rating of 4. Orientation to distributive education and DECA ranked second as to the degree of helpfulness, as 31 (41.3 percent) of the 75 respondents gave it a 1 rating.

An examination of Table XIII reveals that 23 (60.5 percent) of the 38 respondents feel that less time should be spent on inventory control, whereas 27 (81.8 percent) of the 33 responding feel that additional time should be given to special skills in selling. In addition, 27 (79.4 percent) of the 34 responding are of the opinion that less time should be spent on orientation to distributive education and DECA; and 17 (70.8 percent) feel that more time should be allotted for the study of buying, pricing, and receiving.

Units of Study in Distributive Education--Second Semester--Junior Year. In the second semester of distributive education, there are generally nine units covered--advertising, basic mathematics, business organization and policies, credit and collections, data processing, display, government and retailing, human relations--communications, and pricing.

In analyzing the data in Table XIV, it is noted that the unit on human relations--communications--has the highest frequency as being the

TABLE XI

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA NEBRASKA, TO THE STATEMENT, "CHECK THE TYPE OF EDUCATION (TRAINING), IF ANY, YOU HAVE RECEIVED BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL."

Type of Training (Institution)	Number of Responses	Percent
Business College	6	10.8
Two-Year College	2	3.6
Four-Year College	25	44.6
Correspondence School	0	0
In-Service Training	12	21.4
Technical College	7	12.5
Other	4	7.1
Totals	56	100.0

TABLE XII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, TO THE STATEMENT, "OF THE FOLLOWING UNITS STUDIED IN YOUR FIRST SEMESTER (JUNIOR YEAR) OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION, INDICATE BY 1, 2, 3, 4 THE ORDER OF HELPFULNESS."

Unit of Study	NR*	(Degree of Helpfulness)							
		High						Low	
		1	2	3	4	No.	%	No.	%
Orientation to Distributive Education and DECA	75	31	41.3	14	18.7	11	14.7	19	25.3
Special Skills in Selling	77	33	42.9	21	27.2	20	26.0	3	3.9
Buying, Pricing, Receiving	74	22	29.7	23	31.1	24	32.4	5	6.8
Inventory Control	72	10	13.9	13	18.1	21	29.2	28	38.8
Totals	298	96	32.2	71	23.8	76	25.5	55	18.5

*Number of Responses to Each Unit of Study--

TABLE XIII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, TO THE QUESTION, "OF THE FOLLOWING UNITS STUDIED IN YOUR FIRST SEMESTER (JUNIOR YEAR) OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION, OF WHICH, IF ANY, SHOULD HAVE LESS OR ADDITIONAL TIME BEEN SPENT?"

Unit of Study	Number of Responses	Less Time		Additional Time	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Orientation to Distributive Education and DECA	34	27	79.4	7	20.6
Special Skills in Selling	33	6	18.2	27	81.8
Buying, Pricing, Receiving	24	7	29.2	17	70.8
Inventory Control	38	23	60.5	15	39.5
Totals	129	63	48.8	66	51.2

TABLE XIV

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, TO THE STATEMENT, "OF THE FOLLOWING UNITS STUDIED IN YOUR SECOND SEMESTER (JUNIOR YEAR) OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION, INDICATE BY 1, 2, 3, 4 ETC. THE ORDER OF HELPFULNESS."

Unit of Study	NR*	(Degree of Helpfulness)									Low								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	No. %	No. %							
Advertising	60	8	13	12	20	1	2	9	15	12	20	2	3	4	7	0	0		
Basic Mathematics	63	20	32	2	3	9	14	8	13	0	0	4	6	12	19	1	2	7	11
Business Organization and Policies	65	12	19	18	28	7	11	9	14	7	11	5	8	3	4	3	4	1	1
Credit and Collections	74	8	11	9	12	11	15	6	8	9	12	6	8	11	15	11	15	3	4
Data Processing	57	5	9	2	4	2	4	2	4	3	5	6	10	6	10	10	17	21	37
Display	68	3	5	12	18	14	21	14	21	5	7	3	4	7	10	5	7	5	7
Government and Retailing	61	5	8	1	2	12	20	4	7	7	11	7	12	10	16	10	16	5	8
Human Relations--Communications	77	33	43	14	18	15	20	7	9	1	1	4	6	1	1	1	1	1	1
Pricing	67	3	5	10	15	10	15	10	15	10	15	7	10	9	13	5	7	3	5
Totals	592	97	16	80	14	81	14	69	12	54	9	54	9	61	10	50	8	46	8

*Number of Responses to Each Unit of Study--

most helpful unit, as 33 (43 percent) of the 77 responses are under the high rating of 1. This is followed by basic mathematics, where 20 (32 percent) of the graduates responding to this question gave it a relatively high mark as to the degree of helpfulness. In contrast, the least helpful or beneficial unit studied seems to be data processing, with 21 (37 percent) of the 57 respondents giving it a low rating of 9.

An inspection of Table XV shows the number and percent of responses to the question, "Of the following units studied in your second semester (junior year) of distributive education, on which, if any, should have less or additional time been spent?" Again, the unit on human relations--communications--ranked the highest with 38 responses. Of that number, 35 (92.1 percent) indicated additional time, whereas 3 (7.9 percent) checked less time. Seventeen (85.0 percent) of the 20 who checked business organization and policies think that additional time should be spent on this unit. In contrast, 19 (70.4 percent) out of the 27 graduates responding indicated that less time should be spent on data processing. This is followed by government and retailing where 15 (55.6 percent) of the 27 responding feel that less time should be spent on this unit.

Units of Study in Senior Year of Distributive Education. Advertising, communications in marketing, customer services, display and promotion, economics of marketing, introduction to marketing research, job interviews, math in marketing, physical distribution, product planning, salesmanship, and wholesaling are generally among the units of study in the senior year of distributive education. Statistics pertaining to the degree of helpfulness, which ranges from 1 (high) to 11 (low), are shown in Table XVI.

Apparently, among the most helpful units studied are customer service and job interviews. Twenty-five (34 percent) out of 74 gave customer

TABLE XV

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, TO THE QUESTION, "OF THE FOLLOWING UNITS STUDIED IN YOUR SECOND SEMESTER (JUNIOR YEAR) OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION, ON WHICH, IF ANY, SHOULD HAVE LESS OR ADDITIONAL TIME BEEN SPENT?"

Unit of Study	Number of Responses	Less Time		Additional Time	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Advertising	23	4	17.4	19	82.6
Basic Mathematics	34	11	32.4	23	67.6
Business Organization and Policies	20	3	15.0	17	85.0
Credit and Collections	19	5	26.3	14	73.7
Data Processing	27	19	70.4	8	29.6
Display	17	5	29.4	12	70.6
Government and Retailing	27	15	55.6	12	44.4
Human Relations--Communications	38	3	7.9	35	92.1
Pricing	19	9	47.4	10	52.6
Totals	224	74	33.0	150	67.0

TABLE XVI

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, TO THE STATEMENT, "OF THE FOLLOWING UNITS STUDIED IN YOUR SENIOR YEAR OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION, INDICATE BY 1, 2, 3, ETC. THE ORDER OF HELPFULNESS."

Unit	NR*	(Degree of Helpfulness)											Low										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	% No.	% No.									
Advertising	64	10	16	9	14	13	20	8	13	1	2	4	6	2	3	6	9	2	3	3	5	6	9
Communications in Marketing**	61	7	11	7	11	11	18	6	10	6	10	5	8	3	5	4	7	4	7	4	7	4	7
Customer Services	74	25	24	17	23	9	12	6	8	0	0	4	5	5	7	1	1	2	3	1	1	4	6
Display and Promotion	64	11	17	8	13	9	14	7	11	7	11	3	5	4	6	6	9	3	5	4	6	2	3
Economics of Marketing	65	5	8	6	9	3	5	5	8	8	12	9	14	7	11	1	2	5	8	13	20	3	5
Intro. to Market- ing Research	65	4	6	11	17	3	5	1	1	6	9	6	9	7	11	7	11	7	11	4	6	9	14

Table Continued on Next Page--

TABLE XVI CONTINUED

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, TO THE STATEMENT, "OF THE FOLLOWING UNITS STUDIED IN YOUR SENIOR YEAR OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION, INDICATE BY 1, 2, 3, ETC. THE ORDER OF HELPFULNESS."

Unit	NR*	(Degree of Helpfulness)											Low										
		High												Low									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11											
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%									
Job Interviews**	75	25	33	24	32	6	8	3	4	3	4	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1				
Math in Marketing	67	10	15	7	10	9	13	5	8	9	13	12	18	1	2	4	6	3	4	2	3	5	8
Physical Distribution**	60	5	8	1	2	0	0	2	3	3	5	5	8	11	18	2	3	5	8	11	18	15	25
Product Planning	59	3	5	2	3	4	7	2	3	4	7	7	12	10	17	9	15	6	10	5	9	7	12
Salesmanship	77	17	22	12	16	10	13	10	13	13	17	4	5	2	3	3	3	3	4	1	1	2	3
Wholesaling**	64	6	9	2	3	0	0	2	3	2	3	6	9	6	9	10	16	11	17	6	9	13	20
Totals	795	128	16	106	13	77	10	57	7	64	8	69	9	61	8	55	7	52	6	55	7	71	9

*Number of Responses to Each Unit of Study--

**Total Does Not Equal 100 Percent Because of Rounding--

service a 1, and 25 (33 percent) out of 75 gave job interviews a 1. Among the least helpful units studied are physical distribution, wholesaling, and introduction to marketing, as each of these received an 11, with the breakdown as follows: physical distribution, 15 (25 percent) out of 60; wholesaling, 13 (20 percent) out of 64; introduction to research, 9 (14 percent) out of 65.

From this study, it appears that additional time should be devoted to job interviews, salesmanship, display and promotion, and advertising. The number of responses and the number and percent of additional time are: job interviews, 27 (87.1 percent) out of 31; salesmanship, 21 (80.8 percent) out of 26; display and promotion, 21 (77.8 percent) out of 27; and advertising, 20 (71.4 percent) out of 28. Table XVII contains these data.

Attendance. A thorough look at Table XVIII will reveal the number and percent of June, 1970, distributive education graduates, Omaha Public High Schools, responding to the statement, "The teachers should stress the importance of attendance at school and/or on the job." All participants reacted to this statement, with 71 (70.2 percent) strongly agreeing, 24 (23.8 percent) agreeing, 5 (5.0 percent) undecided, and only 1 (1.0 percent) strongly disagreeing.

High School Training in Distributive Education and First Full-Time Job. Table XIX contains information about the statement, "Your high school training in distributive education adequately prepared you for your first full-time job." It is interesting to observe that 14 (13.9 percent) of the participants in this study did not react to this statement. However, it is encouraging that 40 (39.5 percent) of the participants do agree with the statement, while 11 (10.9 percent) strongly agree. Of the

TABLE XVII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, TO THE QUESTION, "OF THE FOLLOWING UNITS STUDIED IN YOUR SENIOR YEAR OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION, ON WHICH, IF ANY, SHOULD HAVE LESS OR ADDITIONAL TIME BEEN SPENT?"

Unit of Study	Number of Responses	Less Time		Additional Time	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Advertising	28	8	28.6	20	71.4
Communications in Marketing	24	10	41.7	14	58.3
Customer Services	20	6	30.0	14	70.0
Display and Promotion	27	6	22.2	21	77.8
Economics of Marketing	21	7	33.3	14	66.7
Intro. to Marketing Research	23	15	65.2	8	34.8
Job Interviews	31	4	12.9	27	87.1
Math in Marketing	25	8	32.0	17	68.0
Physical Distribution	24	18	75.0	6	25.0
Product Planning	21	12	57.1	9	42.9
Salesmanship	26	5	19.2	21	80.8
Wholesaling	22	16	72.7	6	27.3
Totals	292	115	39.4	177	60.6

TABLE XVIII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES,
 OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, RESPONDING TO THE
 STATEMENT, "THE TEACHERS SHOULD STRESS THE IMPORTANCE OF
 ATTENDANCE AT SCHOOL AND/OR ON THE JOB."

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	71	70.2
Agree	24	23.8
Undecided	5	5.0
Disagree	0	0
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Totals	101	100.0

TABLE XIX

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, RESPONDING TO THE STATEMENT, "YOUR HIGH SCHOOL TRAINING IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION ADEQUATELY PREPARED YOU FOR YOUR FIRST FULL-TIME JOB." EIGHTY-SEVEN OF THE 101 PARTICIPANTS RESPONDED.

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	11	10.9
Agree	40	39.5
Undecided	17	16.8
Disagree	14	13.9
Strongly Disagree	5	5.0
No Response	14	13.9
Totals	101	100.0

remaining, 17 (16.8 percent) are undecided, 14 (13.9 percent) disagree, and 5 (5.0 percent) strongly disagree.

On-the-Job Training. Six (5.9 percent) of the participants did not respond to the statement, "On-the-job training (cooperative distributive education) helped 'bridge the gap' between school and your first full-time job." This data, along with other data, are shown in Table XX. On the other hand, 39 (38.7 percent) do agree with the statement, whereas only 2 (1.9 percent) strongly disagree. In addition, 21 (20.8 percent) strongly agree, 18 (17.8 percent) could not decide, and 15 (14.9 percent) disagree.

Instructional Materials. Responses and statistics pertaining to the statement, "The instructional materials used in your distributive education classes were up to date and helpful," are given in Table XXI. It is surprising to note that nearly one-third of the respondents marked "undecided," 23 (22.8 percent), "disagree," 8 (7.9 percent), and "strongly disagree," 5 (5.0 percent). Some commented that some materials were up to date and helpful--others were not. However, they did not justify their comments.

In general, the professional people involved with the selection of instructional materials to be used in distributive education classes have always prided themselves with the quality and quantity of such materials.

On the positive side, about one-half of the respondents, 49, (48.5 percent) agree with the statement; and 16 (15.8 percent) strongly agree.

Individual Projects. According to this study, it appears that additional emphasis should be placed on individual projects relating to on-the-job training and the student's career objectives, as 84 (83.2 percent)

TABLE XX

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, RESPONDING TO THE STATEMENT, "ON-THE-JOB TRAINING (COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION) HELPED 'BRIDGE THE GAP' BETWEEN SCHOOL AND YOUR FIRST FULL-TIME JOB." NINETY-FIVE OF THE 101 PARTICIPANTS RESPONDED.

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	21	20.8
Agree	39	38.7
Undecided	18	17.8
Disagree	15	14.7
Strongly Disagree	2	1.9
No Response	6	5.9
Totals	101	100.0

TABLE XXI

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES,
OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, RESPONDING TO THE
STATEMENT, "THE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS USED IN YOUR DISTRIBUTIVE
EDUCATION CLASSES WERE UP TO DATE AND HELPFUL."

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	16	15.8
Agree	49	48.5
Undecided	23	22.8
Disagree	8	7.9
Strongly Disagree	5	5.0
Totals	101	100.0

agree or strongly agree with the statement relevant to this inquiry; and only 2 (2.0 percent) disagree or strongly disagree. However, 15 (14.8 percent) checked "undecided"; and no one volunteered any comments as to why. These data are shown in Table XXII.

DECA--An Integral Part of the Distributive Education Program. Frequently, DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America) is referred to as the "show case" of the distributive education program, as it provides many opportunities for students to appear before merchant and educational groups as well as for the numerous activities of the youth organization to be publicized through local, state, and national media. Of significance is DECA's national insignia. It is a diamond centered with a wrapped package, which reflects the purposes of the youth organization. The points of the diamond symbolize vocational understanding, civic consciousness, social intelligence, and leadership development; and the wrapped package symbolizes a well-rounded education in preparation for life.¹

Since considerable time and effort are devoted to explaining the purposes of DECA and the symbolic meanings of the national insignia, DECA members should be well indoctrinated insofar as these features of the curriculum are concerned. Consequently, an analysis of the data contained in Table XXIII about the reactions to the statement, "In your opinion, DECA is a very integral part of the distributive education program," should provide helpful information for DECA advisors and other concerned professional personnel as to the worth of such an organization.²

¹Lucy C. Crawford and Warren G. Meyer, Organization and Administration of Distributive Education (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972), pp. 182-184.

²Ibid., 184.

TABLE XXII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, RESPONDING TO THE STATEMENT, "ADDITIONAL EMPHASIS SHOULD BE PLACED ON INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS RELATING TO ON-THE-JOB TRAINING AND THE STUDENT'S CAREER OBJECTIVES."

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	30	29.7
Agree	54	53.5
Undecided	15	14.8
Disagree	1	1.0
Strongly Disagree	1	1.0
Totals	101	100.0

TABLE XXIII

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES,
 OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, RESPONDING TO THE
 STATEMENT, "IN YOUR OPINION, DECA IS A VERY INTEGRAL PART
 OF THE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM."

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	34	33.6
Agree	48	47.5
Undecided	11	10.9
Disagree	4	4.0
Strongly Disagree	4	4.0
Totals	101	100.0

It should be gratifying to them to ascertain that 82 (81.9 percent) of the graduates strongly agree or agree, whereas 4 (4.0 percent) disagree; and 4 (4.0 percent) strongly disagree with the statement. There are 11 (10.9 percent) who are undecided. Of this number, one respondent implied that DECA's role is perhaps too dominating in the program.

Evaluation of High School Business Education Courses. The question, "Which business education courses taken in high school were most helpful to you?" brought varied responses insofar as the degree of helpfulness is concerned. These responses are among the data included in Table XXIV, and it should be pointed out that the degree of helpfulness range is from 1 through 10, with 1 being the highest rating.

The first year of distributive education, the course with the highest frequency, was rated as being the most helpful, as 27.8 percent (20) of the 72 respondents gave it a 1. General business was included by 29.4 percent of the 51 respondents as being very helpful, while beginning typewriting ranked third with a frequency of 15 or 26.3 percent of the 57 respondents indicating that it was very helpful.

Two of the 52 respondents attribute little or no value to cooperative distributive education, as they gave it a low rating of 10; and only 1 of the 57 respondents indicated that beginning typewriting was not very helpful and gave it a low rating of 10.

Business Education Courses Offered in High School Which Respondents Wish They Had Taken. As indicated in Table XXV, Shorthand I-II appears to be the most popular course which participants wish they had taken while in high school. Of the 200 responses received, it received 30 or 15.0 percent of them. Business Law I-II received 27 or 13.5 percent, while Bookkeeping

TABLE XXIV

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS OMAHA, NEBRASKA, RESPONDING TO THE QUESTION, "WHICH BUSINESS EDUCATION COURSES TAKEN IN HIGH SCHOOL WERE MOST HELPFUL TO YOU?" INDICATE BY 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, ETC. THE ORDER OF HELPFULNESS.

Course	*NR	(Degree of Helpfulness)										Low
		High					Low					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		No. **%	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %
Bookkeeping I-II	46	11 24	11 24	8 17	6 13	3 7	4 4	1 2	2 4	0 0	0 0	0 0
Bookkeeping III-IV	5	4 80	1 20	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Business Law I-II	22	4 18	5 23	4 18	3 14	3 14	3 14	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Coop. Dist. Ed. I-II	52	9 17	9 17	9 17	8 15	7 14	7 14	1 2	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 4
Coop. Office Ed. I-II	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Dist. Ed. I-II	72	20 28	13 18	18 25	6 8	6 8	3 4	5 7	0 0	1 1	0 0	0 0
Dist. Ed. III-IV	63	8 13	19 30	8 13	12 19	5 8	4 6	3 5	4 7	0 0	0 0	0 0
General Business I-II	51	15 29	3 6	15 29	8 16	5 10	1 2	1 2	2 4	1 2	0 0	0 0
Office Practices I-II	17	4 24	4 24	0 0	3 18	2 12	2 12	1 6	0 0	1 6	0 0	0 0
Shorthand I-II	6	3 50	0 0	1 17	2 33	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Shorthand III-IV	2	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 50	1 50	0 0	0 0	0 0
Typewriting I-II	57	15 26	14 25	7 12	4 7	8 14	4 7	3 5	0 0	1 2	1 2	2 4
Typewriting III-IV	27	2 7	8 30	6 22	4 15	3 11	2 7	2 7	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Totals	420	95 23	87 21	76 18	56 13	42 10	30 7	18 4	9 2	4 1	3 1	1 0

*Number of Responses--Each Course--

**To Facilitate Spacing, the Percentages in the Above Table Are Rounded Off to Whole Numbers--

TABLE XXV

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES OF JUNE, 1970, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES, OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA, TO THE QUESTION, "OF THE BUSINESS COURSES OFFERED IN HIGH SCHOOL, WHICH DO YOU WISH YOU HAD TAKEN?"

Course	Number of Responses	Percent
Bookkeeping I-II	26	13.0
Bookkeeping III-IV	26	13.0
Business Law I-II	27	13.5
Cooperative Office Education I-II	4	2.0
General Business I-II	9	4.5
Office Practices I-II	23	11.5
Shorthand I-II	30	15.0
Shorthand III-IV	21	10.5
Typewriting I-II	15	7.5
Typewriting III-IV	19	9.5
Totals	200	100.0

I-II and Bookkeeping III-IV tied for third with a frequency of 26 or 13.0 percent each.

Other courses that received 15 or more responses are: Office Practices I-II, 23; Shorthand III-IV, 21; Typewriting III-IV, 19; and Typewriting I-II, 15.

Business Education Courses Not Offered Which Respondents Wish They Could Have Taken. Based on the small number of responses (28) to the question, "Which business education courses not offered do you wish you could have taken?" it would seem that business educators need to do a much better job of selling the business education courses. Some of the courses suggested by the respondents for inclusion in the business education curriculum--for example, keypunch, salesmanship, business mathematics, finance, income tax, human relations, and selling techniques--are already units incorporated in the various business education courses.

Apparently, a number of these units were not stressed by some of the teachers. However, it is noted that, since the respondents were graduated, additional emphasis has been placed on data processing in office practices and bookkeeping, as five suggested that a course of this nature be offered.

One graduate suggested that a course be offered in real estate. Since there are units pertaining to this topic in general business and business law, it would not seem feasible to offer an entire course on this topic at the high school level. The same also applies to the feasibility of offering an entire course devoted to government and business. Two respondents suggested that a course entitled business management be offered. Again, this topic is stressed in the distributive education courses, general business, business law, economics, and bookkeeping.

Even though business mathematics is emphasized in many of the business education courses, three students are of the opinion that there should be a separate course offered. In examining the high school curriculum, it appears that a great deal of business mathematics is incorporated in Math Fundamentals I-II, which, in general, is taught by the teachers in the Mathematics Department in the Omaha Public Schools.

Even though the importance of effective human relations is stressed in all of the business education courses, a graduate indicated that a separate course should be devoted to it. It should also be noted that a number of respondents alluded to the importance of human relations in answering previous statements and questions.

Suggestions for the Improvement of the Distributive Education Program. The respondents were asked to state suggestions for improvement of the distributive education program. The following are typical comments:

More individualized help.

Closer contact with the individual student to see that he is getting something out of the course.

Closer relationships among pupil, teacher, and employer.

Better textbooks are needed. Ours were vague and out of date. Relate the course more to the students' individual jobs.

Relate actual business practices to students. Show them how to inventory, how to work in a system like a department store, how to determine customers' needs and wants, and how to find out about a product. Put them in hypothetical situations where they have to make decisions on their own.

More emphasis on the individual's career. Also, it seemed that they just wanted to get you a job. It may not even have interested you; but as long as you had a job, it did not matter.

Place students on jobs in which they are interested.

I think the program is just great, and it has helped me. It has helped me determine my career and what major to take in college.

As in all classes, continue to hire excited, dedicated teachers--teachers who are willing to work with all types of students. Weed out the 'deadwood' teachers.

I feel you have a fine program and a lot of enthusiasm behind it. Keep the good work going as it is a helpful tool.

I do not know if you offer scholarships, but this would be an area to consider.

Distributive education could be improved by putting emphasis on the bookwork behind the business. Too much emphasis was put on the selling part.

Place more emphasis on small companies.

Place more emphasis on making a good sale and how to handle a dissatisfied customer.

I feel that my distributive education class was very interesting and helped me a lot in finding each job I have had.

I think the D. E. courses should be offered in the early grades.

It should be impressed on the minds of the students how helpful these courses will be if they plan to enter the business world upon being graduated from high school.

I think these courses are excellent for most anyone.

Have counselors tell pupils about D. E. Students usually have not heard of the classes. Students will like D. E. better if they can learn with no pressure.

Help the student find a job in the field of his choice or advise him as to what further training is necessary.

My teacher made the entire class worthwhile. I owe much of my success to him.

Teachers should stress the importance of being present at school and on the job. More stress should be put on communications among people.

Let the class work more together.

Do not stress the importance of a retail store clerk. I do not feel this is sales, but merely order taking. Let the students study the five great rules of selling--attention, interest, conviction, desire, closing--and study really successful people.

Do not stress help in finding jobs and early dismissal. Make sure the students are really interested in learning what distributive education has to offer.

Distributive education courses are good for the high school level. Make distributive education a more personal thing to each student.

Be strict about homework and make the student feel involved.

I want to stress the point that I did not enjoy distributive education at all.

While some of the comments do not relate directly to the improvement of the distributive education program, they do at least relate indirectly. In general, it would appear that the comments reflect anticipated "traditional thinking" insofar as respondents of this age group are concerned. Many of their comments provide "food for thought" and should be considered when evaluating the distributive education program.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The main purpose of this investigation was to conduct a follow-up study of the distributive education students who were graduated in June, 1970, from six Omaha, Nebraska, Public High Schools--Benson, Burke, Central, North, South, and Technical--to determine the effectiveness of the current distributive education curriculum.

The main hypothesis stated that the majority of the June, 1970, distributive education graduates would be employed directly or indirectly in an area of distribution for which they received high school training.

Data for this study were obtained through two sources: (1) a survey of related literature pertaining to follow-up studies, with emphasis on distributive education; and (2) a questionnaire, which was mailed to 229 June, 1970, graduates who were enrolled in distributive education during their senior year.

A total of 101 graduates responded, representing a 44.1 percent return. Of the 101 respondents, 87 (86 percent) were employed, and 2 (2.0 percent) were unemployed. In addition, 6 (6 percent) were in military service, 4 (4.0 percent) were homemakers, and 2 (2 percent) were full-time students.

Eighty-seven of the 101 respondents were employees--16 part time, 71 full time. Of the 87 employed respondents, 51 (58.6 percent) were working in the field for which they received training while in high school;

and 26 (29.9 percent) were holding jobs in a related field. Only 10 (11.5 percent) were working in a non-related field.

Nearly 86 percent of the employed respondents were working in service and retail sales types of businesses and were working for firms that employ from 2 to 3,000 persons.

A wide range of monthly wages was found in this study, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100. The low figure represented a part-time employee. The majority of the respondents' wages fell within the \$300 to \$699 bracket.

The most frequently used sources in securing employment were through friends and/or relatives and self-contact. In order to secure their present jobs, 73 (83.9 percent) of the 87 respondents said that high school was the minimum level of education required.

Of the 73 graduates who responded to the question, "How many times have you changed jobs since being graduated from high school?" 20 have each held 1 job; 23 have each held 2; 2 have each held 4; 2 have each held 5; 1 has held 20; 1 has held 6; and 1 has held 8. Thirty-eight stated that they received a promotion to a higher paying job with their respective company, and 20 stated they did not receive an advancement or promotion with their present company. The study revealed that the three most popular reasons for changing jobs were: better pay, better working conditions, and less boredom.

An analysis of the data revealed that special skills in selling appeared to be the most helpful unit studied in distributive education during the first semester of the junior year, while the least helpful unit studied was inventory control. A significant number felt that less time should be spent on orientation to distributive education and DECA, whereas additional time should be spent in studying buying, pricing and receiving.

In the second semester of distributive education, junior year, the unit on human relations--communications--received the highest frequency as being the most helpful; and the least beneficial unit studied was data processing. Many of the respondents also stated that additional time should be spent on the unit on human relations and less time on data processing.

Customer service and job interviews were among the most helpful units studied during their senior year of distributive education. In contrast, the units cited as having been least helpful were: physical distribution, wholesaling, and introduction to marketing.

All of the participants responded to the statement, "The teachers should stress the importance of attendance at school and/or on the job," with nearly 95 percent either strongly agreeing or agreeing.

Nearly 51 percent of the respondents felt that their high school training in distributive education adequately prepared them for their first full-time job, and about 41 percent thought that on-the-job training (cooperative distributive education) helped "bridge the gap" between school and their first full-time job.

It was surprising to ascertain from this study that nearly one-third of the respondents remarked that they were undecided about or disagreed with the statement, "The instructional materials used in your distributive education classes were up to date and helpful." On the other hand, it was revealed that 65 percent agreed with the statement.

Apparently, additional emphasis should be placed on individual projects relating to on-the-job training and the student's career objectives, as approximately 84 percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement pertaining to this inquiry.

Eighty-two of the participants concurred with the opinion that DECA is a very integral part of the distributive education program.

According to those who responded to the question, "Which business education courses taken in high school were most helpful to you?" the first year of distributive education ranked first, followed by general business and beginning typewriting.

The most popular course which participants wished they had taken while in high school was shorthand. Business law ranked second, and beginning and advanced bookkeeping tied for third.

The participants were also asked to reply to the question, "Which business education courses not offered do you wish you could have taken?" An analysis of the responses to this question revealed that the majority of the courses suggested--keypunch, salesmanship, business mathematics, finance, income tax, human relations, and selling techniques--are already units of study included in the business education curriculum. A significant number emphasized that there should be a course devoted solely to human relations--communications.

Not very many of the respondents had any suggestions for the improvement of the distributive education curriculum or program. Of the minimal number who did, the most frequently mentioned suggestion was individualization. The need for closer relationships among student, teacher-coordinator, and employer and the need to make the student feel involved were also emphasized.

Only 56 responses were received to the statement, "Check the type of education (training), if any, you have received beyond high school."

Of the 25 who checked four-year college, only 2 were full-time students. Twelve had received in-service training; 7 had attended a technical

college, while 4 received some "other" type of training. Of this number, 2 received beauty school training, 1 received nurse's training, and 1 was in the Christian Brotherhood for eight months. The majority did not indicate anything under "length of attendance."

Conclusions

The major conclusions of this investigation pertaining to a distributive education follow-up study of the June, 1970, graduates of the Omaha Public High Schools, Omaha, Nebraska, are as follows:

1. An analysis of the preceding data should provide useful information for principals, supervisors, department heads, teacher-coordinators, counselors, teachers, and others who plan and direct the distributive education program.

2. Educators can no longer assume that the high school is not responsible for the student after he is graduated. Instead, they must work with employers to build a bridge between school and work.

3. This three-year follow-up study should aid in determining job histories, worker mobility, and worker adjustment patterns of the June, 1970, distributive education graduates of the Omaha Public High Schools.

4. Basically, most of the respondents were utilizing their training and abilities. A minimal number had secured supplementary education through programs in local universities, business colleges, technical colleges, beauty colleges, and company in-service classes.

5. Most respondents secured their first full-time employment through relatives and/or friends and self-contact.

6. At the time of this study, the majority of the employed respondents were working directly or indirectly in an area of distribution for which they received high school training.

7. Service and retail sales were identified the most often as the types of business where respondents were employed.

8. Most of the employed respondents have held one or two full-time jobs since being graduated from high school.

9. Better pay, better working conditions, and less boredom were among the most popular reasons given for changing jobs.

10. The majority of the respondents' wages fell within the \$300 to \$699 monthly bracket.

11. In general, the graduates were cognizant of the relevance of the cooperative and DECA features of the distributive education program.

12. Respondents recognized that special skills in selling was the most helpful unit studied in distributive education during the first semester of their junior year and also indicated that human relations--communications--was the most helpful unit studied during the second semester of their junior year.

13. Among the units perceived as being the most helpful during the senior year were customer service and job interviews, which, of course, involved human relations.

14. The graduates perceived the importance of typewriting as a tool of communication and also perceived the knowledge of basic mathematics as essential in the business world.

15. A number of respondents made the following suggestions for improving the distributive education program: better informed counseling; up-to-date instructional materials; more emphasis on the individual and

his career; increased stress on involvement and basic skills--salesmanship, basic business mathematics--human relations, display and promotion, advertising, buying, selling, and receiving; less emphasis on orientation to distributive education and DECA, data processing, physical distribution, wholesaling, and introduction to marketing research; additional emphasis on the importance of attendance at school and/or on the job.

Recommendations

On the basis of the results as interpreted through this investigation, and those of other studies which have been reviewed in this field project, recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the distributive education program in the Omaha Public Schools include the following:

1. In addition to continuing the one-year follow-up studies, follow-up studies should be conducted every three years in an attempt, among other things, to ascertain job histories, worker mobility, and worker adjustment patterns of former students.
2. All students who can profit from the distributive education program should be made aware of the program offerings and provisions by the guidance counselors, teacher-coordinators, and other concerned professional personnel.
3. Potential distributive education students should also be made aware of the other business education courses; namely, general business, bookkeeping, typewriting, business law, and office practices.
4. The distributive education personnel should continue to make students cognizant of the relevance of the cooperative and DECA features of the distributive education program.

5. The distributive education teacher-coordinators should make every attempt to correlate the student's part-time job with the student's interest and ability.

6. Concerned professional personnel should evaluate meticulously the units of study in the distributive education program in order to assess the relevance as well as the time allotment for each unit of study.

7. Wherever feasible, the individualized approach should be utilized.

8. Greater effort should be exerted on the part of the teacher-coordinators and counselors to assist the graduates in obtaining their first full-time jobs--better vocational placement services.

9. The distributive education teacher-coordinators should always work to attain and maintain close working relationships with counselors, students, employers, and parents, as well as administrators.

10. Additional emphasis should be placed on the importance of attendance at school and/or on the job.

11. Concerned professional personnel should keep abreast of current trends in employment in order that accurate information may be imparted to youth who desire to prepare for careers in distribution.

12. An attempt should be made to obtain scholarships for those youth who plan to further their education in the field of distribution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Crawford, Lucy C., and Warren G. Meyer. Organization and Administration of Distributive Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972.
- Harms, Harm, and others. Methods of Teaching Business and Distributive Education. Third edition. West Chicago: South-Western Publishing Company, 1972.
- Mason, Ralph E., and Peter G. Haines. Cooperative Occupational Education and Work Experience in the Curriculum. Danville: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Roberts, Roy W. Vocational and Practical Arts Education--History, Development, and Principles. Third edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

YEARBOOKS AND HANDBOOK

- Brendel, Leroy, and Herbert Yengel, eds. Changing Methods of Teaching Business Subjects. National Business Education Yearbook, No. 10. Washington, D. C.: National Business Education Association, 1972.
- Calhoun, Calfred C., and Mildred Hillestad, eds. Contributions of Research to Business Education. National Business Education Yearbook, No. 9. Washington, D. C.: National Business Education Association, 1971.
- Coakley, Carroll B., ed. Distributive Education: Teacher-Coordinators' Handbook. Danville: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Hall, J. Curtis, and others, eds. Business Education: An Evaluative Inventory. National Business Education Yearbook, No. 6. Washington, D. C.: National Business Education Association, 1968.
- Huffman, Harry, and others, eds. Criteria for Evaluating Business and Office Education. National Business Education Yearbook, No. 7. Washington, D. C.: National Business Education Association, 1969.

Maxwell, Gerald W., and William L. Winnett, eds. Relevance in the Education of Today's Business Student. National Business Education Yearbook, No. 11. Washington, D. C.: National Business Education Association, 1973.

Travis, Dorothy L., and Lorraine Missling, eds. Selected Readings in Business and Office Occupations. National Business Education Yearbook, No. 5. Washington, D. C.: National Business Education Association, 1967.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT AND ERIC REPORTS

Ashmun, Richard D., and Roger A. Larson. Review and Synthesis of Research on Distributive Education. Second edition. ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, No. 17. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, April, 1970.

Business and Distributive Education Curriculum Guide. Lincoln, Nebraska: State of Nebraska, Department of Education, 1966.

Butler, Roy L., and Edwin G. York. What Teacher-Coordinators Should Know About Cooperative Vocational Education. ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, No. 36. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, August, 1971.

Ebmeier, H. C. What Do They Say? Graduates, Dropouts. Lincoln, Nebraska: State of Nebraska, Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, No Date.

Education for a Changing World of Work. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

Guidelines for Vocational Education--Nebraska--Secondary, Post-Secondary, Adult. Lincoln, Nebraska: State of Nebraska, Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1974.

Laymen's Glossary of Vocational Education Terms. Cleveland: The Manpower Planning and Development Commission, The Welfare Federation of Cleveland, 1969.

Little, J. Kenneth. Review and Synthesis of Research on the Placement and Follow-Up of Vocational Education Students. ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, No. 49. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, February, 1970.

- Miller, Melvin Dee, and Wesley E. Budke. Job Placement and Follow-Up of Secondary School Vocational Education Students. ERIC Reports, No. 32. Washington, D. C.: National Center for Educational Communication--DHEW/OE, 1970.
- Wallace, Harold R. Review and Synthesis of Research on Cooperative Vocational Education. ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, No. 60. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, June, 1970.
- Wenrich, Ralph C. Review and Synthesis of Research on the Administration of Vocational and Technical Education. ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, March, 1970.
- York, Edwin G., and Roy L. Butler. What State Leaders Should Know About Cooperative Vocational Education. ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, No. 38. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, August, 1971.

PERIODICALS

- Albertson, Dorothy. "Preparing Students for 'The First Day,'" Business Education World, LIII (March-April, 1972), pp. 7, 29.
- Cooper, Karen, and others. "Job Placement," The Journal of Business Education, XLIX (January, 1974), pp. 155-156.
- DePianta, Harold J. "A Follow-Up of a Work-Experience Program," The Balance Sheet, XLIX (May, 1968), pp. 404-405.
- DesMarais, Philip. "New Developments in Occupational Training and Vocational Education," The Balance Sheet, XLVI (September, 1964), pp. 21-23.
- Domian, Judi. "Well-Trained D. E. Students Can Cope," American Vocational Journal, XLIX (March, 1974), pp. 45-47.
- Editorial. "Distributive Education--A Nationwide Survey," Business Education World, XLVII (September, 1966), pp. 19-39.
- Harris, E. Edward. "Requirements for Office and Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators," South-Western Monograph, No. 115 (March, 1967).
- Harrison, Wayne J., Jr., "Distributive Education in Wisconsin's High Schools," Business Education World, XLVII (November, 1966), pp. 15-17.
- Illiff, Kathryn M. "The Follow-Up in Business Education," National Business Education Quarterly, XXXV (December, 1966), p. 35.

- Jurist, Rodney G. "Job Placement and Business Education," The Balance Sheet, XLVII (February, 1966), pp. 255-258, 287.
- Kaisershot, Alfred. "A Case for the Follow-Up Study," The Balance Sheet, LII (March, 1972), pp. 248-249.
- Klaurens, Mary K. ". . . Job Satisfaction in Cooperative Distributive Education," Business Education Forum, XXII (April, 1968), pp. 9-10.
- Knouse, Reno S. "Innovations in Distributive Education . . . Planning to Teach," Business Education Forum, XXI (April, 1967), pp. 5-6
- Kourmadas, John F., ed. "Vocational Education," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XLIX (May, 1965).
- LaRowe, Donald P. "Cooperative Distributive Education in Florida's Public Junior Colleges," Business Education Forum, XX (January, 1966), pp. 28-30.
- Llewellyn, Howard C. "How to Plan a Follow-Up Study," Business Education World, XLVII (December, 1967), pp. 19, 25.
- Loven, Larry. "Guidelines for Effective Distributive Education Program Development," The Balance Sheet, XLVII (May, 1966), pp. 403, 432.
- Lowe, Calvin D. "Are You Solving Problems for Youth or Part of the Problem?" Business Education Forum, XXI (November, 1966), pp. 22-23.
- Meyer, Warren G. ". . . Re-evaluation of Distributive Education," Business Education Forum, XXII (January, 1968), pp. 13-16.
- Misner, Harold R. "Expanding Distributive Education to Serve the Field of Distribution," Business Education Forum, XXII (February, 1968), pp. 21-22.
- Palmer, G. Dean. ". . . The Development of a Philosophy of Distributive Education," Business Education Forum, XXII (February, 1968), pp. 9-11.
- Reardon, Bruce. "Utilizing Objectivity in Screening for Distributive Education," The Balance Sheet, LI (February, 1970), pp. 252-253, 275.
- Redington, Randall F. "Public Relations in Distributive Education," The Balance Sheet, LIII (September, 1971), pp. 18-19, 30.
- Seldon, William, and Robert D. Edwards. "Evaluating a Business Education Program," The Balance Sheet, L (March, 1969), pp. 294-300.
- Syhlman, William D. "The Expanding Role of the Distributive Education Curriculum," Business Education Forum, XX (November, 1965), pp. 21-22.

- Warren, Helen. "Give Guidance in Job Finding Techniques," The Balance Sheet, L (March, 1969), pp. 301-304, 317.
- Watson, Evelyn. "Evaluating Cooperative Students," The Journal of Business Education, XLV (March, 1970), pp. 262-263.
- Wood, Merle, and Jane C. Burhoe. "Guidance and the Business Student," The Balance Sheet, LII (February, 1971), pp. 211-213, 236.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Clark, Almond A. "A Survey of Distributive Occupations and Training Opportunities in the Roseville School District #623." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Minnesota, 1968.
- Hecht, Joseph C. "A Follow-Up Study of High School Graduates of Three Retailing Programs." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1963.
- Heisick, Joyce P. "A Follow-Up Study of the Utah State University Business Education, Distributive Education, and Office Administration Graduates, 1959-1968." Unpublished Master's thesis, Utah State University, 1969.
- Holley, Leta F. "Women in Executive and Managerial Positions in Omaha, Nebraska." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1960.
- Kuhn, Ronald G. "The Recruitment and Selection of Student Trainees in a High School Cooperative Distributive Education Program." Unpublished Master's thesis, Winona State College, 1967.
- Lawrence, Layle Duane. "Employment and Educational Experiences of Louisiana Cooperative Vocational Education Participants." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1973.
- McLean, Gary Neil. "Attitudes of Minnesota Office and Distributive Education Coordinators Toward Vocational Student Organizations." Monograph by Phi Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon, University of Minnesota, 1973. (Mimeographed.)
- Parrish, E. H., and others. "A Look at Education for Work in the Omaha Public Schools." Omaha Public Schools, Omaha, 1964. (Mimeographed.)
- Shaink, Marshall R. "A Study of the June, 1969, Jackson Public Schools Distributive Cooperative Education High School Graduates as Compared to a Sample of All June, 1969, Jackson Public High Schools Graduates." Unpublished Independent study, Michigan State University, 1970.

APPENDIX

Omaha Public Schools

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
4167 FURNACEVILLE
OMAHA, NEBRASKA 68131

December, 1973

Dear Graduate

The Department of Vocational Education of the Omaha Public Schools is conducting a follow-up study of the distributive education students who were graduated in June, 1970.

As one of our graduates, would you be so kind as to help us by answering some questions.

Your replies will be helpful to us in determining the strengths and weaknesses and the changes that might be necessary in the program in order to provide an "improved" program for future distributive education students. In addition, we are very interested in knowing the kinds of occupations in which our graduates are involved.

You can do us a great favor by taking about ten minutes of your time to fill in the enclosed questionnaire. While it may appear to be a bit lengthy, it has been designed in such a way so that it can be completed quickly. What you say will be kept in complete confidence and will in no way be connected with your name.

For your convenience in returning the questionnaire, a stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed. We will appreciate very much your extending us this cooperation, and we look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

S: Edwin H. Parrish
Edwin H. Parrish
Edwin H. Parrish
Assistant Superintendent
Vocational Education

Joseph A. Nebel
Joseph A. Nebel

Enclosures 2

December 28, 1973

Dear Graduate

In case you did not receive our letter and questionnaire of approximately three weeks ago, we are sending you duplicates.

The Department of Vocational Education of the Omaha Public Schools is conducting a follow-up study of the distributive education students who were graduated in June, 1970.

As one of our graduates, would you be so kind as to help us by answering some questions.

Your replies will be helpful to us in determining the strengths and weaknesses and the changes that might be necessary in the program in order to provide an "improved" program for future distributive education students. In addition, we are very interested in knowing the kinds of occupations in which our graduates are involved.

You can do us a great favor by taking about ten minutes of your time to fill in the enclosed questionnaire. While it may appear to be a bit lengthy, it has been designed in such a way so that it can be completed quickly. What you say will be kept in complete confidence and will in no way be connected with your name.

For your convenience in returning the questionnaire, a stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed. We will appreciate very much your extending us this cooperation. . .

We look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Sincerely

Edwin H. Parrish

Edwin H. Parrish
Assistant Superintendent
Vocational Education

Joseph A. Nebel
Joseph A. Nebel

Enclosures 2

A DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE JUNE, 1970
GRADUATES OF THE OMAHA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS, OMAHA, NEBRASKA

Questionnaire

This survey is being conducted in order to better assess the strengths and weaknesses of the distributive education program in the Omaha Public Schools. The data collected will aid in planning for the future. All data will be regarded as strictly confidential.

I. GENERAL

1. Please place a check mark near your sex.
a) Male b) Female
2. Check the name of the high school from which you were graduated.
a) Benson c) Central e) South
b) Burke d) North f) Technical

II. EMPLOYMENT RELATED

3. Are you employed? Yes No If yes Full Time Part Time
(If you are not employed, please refer to questions 16 through 34.)
4. Your job title _____
5. Your specific duties _____

6. Name of company _____
7. Check the type of business.
a) Education d) Sales (Retail)
b) Government e) Sales (Wholesale) g) Other _____
c) Manufacturing f) Service
8. Company's address _____
(Street) (City) (State) (Zip Code)
9. Check the approximate number of employees in your company at the location where you work.
a) 1-10 c) 51-150 e) Over 500
b) 11-50 d) 151-500 f) Approximate Number _____
10. Please check your monthly wage range.
a) \$250-300 f) \$501-525 k) \$626-650
b) 301-350 g) 526-550 l) 651-675
c) 351-400 h) 551-575 m) 676-700
d) 401-450 i) 576-600 n) \$701-725
e) \$451-500 j) \$601-625 o) Other _____
11. Are you working for the same company for whom you worked while you were a cooperative distributive education student in high school? Yes No
12. How did you locate your job? (CHECK ONE)
a) Friend(s) and/or Relative(s) d) School--D. E. Coordinator or Counselor
b) State Employment Agency e) Newspaper
c) Private Employment Agency f) Other (Specify) _____
13. What formal education was necessary for entry into your occupation?
a) High School d) Two-Year College
b) Business School e) Four-Year College
c) Technical College f) Other (Specify) _____
14. Have you changed jobs or received a promotion?
a) Have received a promotion to a higher paying job with this company
b) Have not received an advancement or promotion with this company
c) Have changed jobs _____ time(s) since being graduated from high school

(Turn over, please.)

15. If you have changed jobs, what were your main reasons for doing so? (YOU MAY CHECK MORE THAN ONE)
- | | |
|---|---|
| a) <input type="checkbox"/> Better Pay | g) <input type="checkbox"/> Marriage |
| b) <input type="checkbox"/> Better Working Conditions | h) <input type="checkbox"/> Moved |
| c) <input type="checkbox"/> Boredom | i) <input type="checkbox"/> Personality Conflict |
| d) <input type="checkbox"/> Family Responsibilities | j) <input type="checkbox"/> Poor Schedule--Hours |
| e) <input type="checkbox"/> Full-Time Education | k) <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| f) <input type="checkbox"/> Illness | l) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |

16. If you are not employed, are you available for employment? Yes No

17. If you are not available for employment, check your status.
- | | |
|---|---|
| a) <input type="checkbox"/> Full-Time Homemaker | c) <input type="checkbox"/> Military Service |
| b) <input type="checkbox"/> Full-Time Student | d) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |

III. SCHOOL RELATED

18. Check the type of education (training), if any, you have received beyond high school. If you have received additional training, also indicate the length of attendance.

Length of Attendance

- | | |
|---|-------|
| a) <input type="checkbox"/> Business College | _____ |
| b) <input type="checkbox"/> Two-Year College | _____ |
| c) <input type="checkbox"/> Four-Year College | _____ |
| d) <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence School | _____ |
| e) <input type="checkbox"/> In-Service Training | _____ |
| f) <input type="checkbox"/> Technical College | _____ |
| g) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ | _____ |

19. Of the following units studied in your first semester (junior year) of distributive education, indicate by 1, 2, 3, etc. the order of helpfulness.

- | |
|--|
| a) <input type="checkbox"/> Orientation to Distributive Education and DECA |
| b) <input type="checkbox"/> Special Skills in Selling |
| c) <input type="checkbox"/> Buying, Pricing, and Receiving |
| d) <input type="checkbox"/> Inventory Control |

20. Of the above--No. 19, on which unit(s), if any, should have less or additional time been spent? (PLEASE CIRCLE)

Less Time: a b c d Additional Time: a b c d

21. Of the following units studied in your second semester (junior year) of distributive education, indicate by 1, 2, 3, etc. the order of helpfulness.

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) <input type="checkbox"/> Advertising | f) <input type="checkbox"/> Display |
| b) <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Mathematics | g) <input type="checkbox"/> Government and Retailing |
| c) <input type="checkbox"/> Business Organization and Policies | h) <input type="checkbox"/> Human Relations--Communications |
| d) <input type="checkbox"/> Credit and Collections | i) <input type="checkbox"/> Pricing |
| e) <input type="checkbox"/> Data Processing | |

22. Of the above--No. 21, on which unit(s), if any, should have less or additional time been spent? (PLEASE CIRCLE)

Less Time: a b c d e f g h i Additional Time: a b c d e f g h i

23. Of the following units studied in your senior year of distributive education, indicate by 1, 2, 3, etc. the order of helpfulness.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) <input type="checkbox"/> Advertising | h) <input type="checkbox"/> Math in Marketing |
| b) <input type="checkbox"/> Communications in Marketing | i) <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Distribution (Transportation) |
| c) <input type="checkbox"/> Customer Services | j) <input type="checkbox"/> Product Planning |
| d) <input type="checkbox"/> Display and Promotion | k) <input type="checkbox"/> Salesmanship |
| e) <input type="checkbox"/> Economics of Marketing | l) <input type="checkbox"/> Wholesaling |
| f) <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction to Marketing Research | |
| g) <input type="checkbox"/> Job Interviews | |

24. Of the above--No. 23, on which unit(s), if any, should have less or additional time been spent? (PLEASE CIRCLE)

Less Time: a b c d e f g h i j k l
 Additional Time: a b c d e f g h i j k l

