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Chapter I

THE PROBLEM

Chapter one is concerned with the identification of the problem. Specifically, the chapter contains the following sections: (1) background of the problem, (2) statement of the problem, (3) research questions, (4) importance of the study, (5) assumptions, (6) limitations, (7) definition of terms, and (8) summary of the chapter.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Vocational education has been an integral part of education in American public schools for almost sixty years. Vocational education has expanded with regard to the number of people it serves and the number of occupations for which it prepares both youth and adults. The rationale for this expansion and growth has been the recognition of the economic and social value to the individual and the social, political, and economic value of vocational education in the state and nation (Swanson, 1971).

As our nation's economy expands, there will be a pronounced need for high levels of performance from everyone during their productive years (Burkett, 1976). Therefore, increased recognition is being given to the fact that the true resources of a nation are its human resources. Taylor (1975) states that vocational education is "... a form of investment in human capital--an investment which provides comparatively high returns to both the individual and society" (p. ix). Investing in
the vocational needs and interests of our nation's youth contributes to worker productivity and has positive effects on economic growth (Weisbrod, 1966).

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 placed vocational education in the mainstream of this nation's effort to focus on the needs and interests of youth. Beaumont (1971) stated that the key concept associated with the 1968 Amendments is "... relevance--relevance not only to the economic requisites of man but also to his goals as a creative being" (p. 17). To accelerate the injection of relevancy into the curriculum, various ideas and programs with common characteristics have been implemented in our nation's school systems to "... build bridges between two worlds of education and work" (Wirtz, 1976, p. 126).

Most job opportunities in the future will require some degree of formal training, and preparation for initial job entry is increasingly becoming the responsibility of our nation's public schools. To insure the acquisition of skills, knowledges, and attitudes required for initial entry into the labor force and to raise the employability of our nation's youth and adults, "we greatly need a system for guiding a person from school to work" (Madden, 1973, p. 4). Cooperative vocational education has been recognized as one of the most effective means of providing for this transition. According to the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education:

The part-time cooperative plan is undoubtedly the best program we have in vocational education. It consistently yields high placement records, high employment stability, and high job satisfaction (U.S. Congress, 1968, p. 1081).

Cooperative vocational education programs are designed to meet the needs
of individuals for occupational preparation and adjustment as well as the needs of society for trained manpower. The Vocational Amendments of 1968 provided funds to extend cooperative education to additional students and provide for a broader range of occupational training.

The success of cooperative vocational education depends on the support and commitment of many individuals and groups. Therefore, a lack of understanding of the purposes of cooperative vocational education can impede the development and operation of the program. Inasmuch as cooperative vocational education is often confused with other less formalized "learn and work" programs, it seems essential that it be defined here as it appears in the Vocational Act of 1976. Cooperative vocational education is:

... a program of vocational education for persons who, through written cooperative arrangements between the school and employers, receive instruction, including required academic courses and related vocational instruction by alternation of study in school with a job in any occupational field, but these two experiences must be planned and supervised by the school and employers so that each contributes to the student's education and to his or her employability (U.S. Congress, 1976, p. 11985).

Cooperative vocational education is an instructional plan designed to enable students to develop the competencies needed for employment in their chosen occupational fields. Distributive education is a vocational program that has historically utilized the cooperative plan of instruction. The distributive education program at the secondary level is designed to prepare student learners for entry level and career jobs in various marketing occupations. The secondary cooperative distributive education program usually consists of two or three years of study with at least one daily class period of related vocational instruction in
distributive subjects and regularly scheduled periods of cooperative training.

Operational policies and procedures for cooperative distributive education programs have been established by personnel in state departments of education, teacher educators, and vocational research personnel throughout the nation. These policies and procedures guide the operation of local cooperative distributive education programs. They help assure the integrity of the program. Professional leaders in distributive education have contributed to the development and maintenance of sound policies and procedures that have been proven effective in carrying out the mission of the program. A philosophy of distributive education was first constructed by Crawford in 1967 and revalidated by her in 1975. These studies, plus those of Warmke (1960), Reece (1971), Harris (1971), and Weatherford (1972) have provided distributive educators with a set of basic beliefs and principles concerning various aspects of the distributive education program. These points of agreement by leaders in the field of distributive education have confirmed the mission of distributive education and given distributive educators a basis for determining the critical tasks of the teacher-coordinator (Crawford, 1967).

A distributive education teacher-coordinator has many duties and responsibilities in addition to those of the regular classroom and in-school laboratory teacher. In order to gain additional insight into the scope and responsibility of the teacher-coordinator, studies were conducted at The Center for Vocational-Technical Education at Ohio State University to identify the critical tasks performed by teacher-coordinators of cooperative vocational programs. These studies, directed by
Cotrell (1971-72), produced a teacher-coordinator task analysis based on the opinions of three hundred experts, fifty from each of six established vocational fields.

The above studies pertaining to basic beliefs and principles of distributive education and the identification of critical tasks of the teacher-coordinator have provided significant guidelines for the operation of cooperative distributive education programs. This study was concerned with an assessment and analysis of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinator opinion toward those recommended coordination activities as identified by Crawford (1975), Cotrell (1972), Weatherford (1972), Harris (1971), and Warmke (1960). Secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi were surveyed to determine their opinion toward recommended coordination activities (Appendix A).

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The central purpose of this study was to assess and analyze the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators employed in the state of Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities. Additionally, this study was designed to examine the relationship between selected demographic variables and opinion toward recommended coordination activities. Those demographic variables were:

1. Years of teaching experience as a secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinator.

2. Type of undergraduate degree held and major field of study.

3. Type of graduate degree held and area of concentration.
4. Occupational experience.

5. The number of completed hours of undergraduate vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Specifically, answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. What are the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities?

2. Does a relationship exist between the number of years of teaching experience of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?

3. Does a relationship exist between the number of years of occupational experience of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?

4. Does a relationship exist between the type of undergraduate degree held by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?

5. Does a relationship exist between the type of graduate degree held by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?
6. Does a relationship exist between the number of completed hours of undergraduate vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Coordination is one of the most important responsibilities assumed by the distributive education teacher-coordinator (Seaverns, 1970). In the role of coordinator, this person is responsible for selecting student-learners, selecting training stations, developing training agreements, developing training plans, coordinating on-the-job training, controlling students on the job, coordinating classroom instruction with on-the-job learning activities, supervising the adult distributive education program, and public relations. Coordination also involves teaching occupational and related subject matter to students and coordinating the efforts of all agencies which can assist in helping the student-learner meet his needs (Ashmun and Klaurens, 1969). Coordination is vital in assisting student-trainees to develop competencies needed in the area of their employment choice.

This study sought to assess and analyze the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities. The major benefits of this study to distributive education personnel in the state of Mississippi are as follows:

1. To provide state supervisors of distributive education and the distributive education teacher educator in Mississippi with
information concerning secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinator opinion toward recommended coordination activities.

2. To provide state supervisors of distributive education and the distributive education teacher educator in Mississippi with data and information which could be used to facilitate the planning and structuring of workshops and consultative services to meet the needs of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators.

3. To provide state supervisors of distributive education and the distributive education teacher educator in Mississippi with information which may be used to revise selected aspects of the pre-service distributive education program.

A major purpose of this study was to acquire information which could be used in planning and structuring in-service offerings related to cooperative distributive education. As Lano (1971) has noted: "Considerable input influencing the direction of in-service activities can be gained by asking the teacher" (p. 41). In-service educational activities have a more vital influence on professional growth if planners (state supervisors of distributive education and distributive education teacher educators) are aware of participants' opinions of prospective in-service offerings (Wilson, 1971).

Information which will help plan and structure selected aspects of both pre-service and in-service educational offerings with regard to cooperative vocational education and distributive education is of vital concern to state supervisors of distributive education and the distributive education teacher educator in Mississippi (Patton, Pace, and Bowers, 1977) (Appendix B).
ASSUMPTIONS

1. The coordination activities identified by Crawford (1975), Cotrell (1972), Weatherford (1972), Harris (1971), and Warmke (1960) represented a valid and comprehensive list of the coordination activities performed by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in the state of Mississippi.

2. The coordination categories identified and utilized in this study were representative of the categories of coordination activities performed by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in the state of Mississippi.

3. Secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in the state of Mississippi would respond honestly and candidly to the survey opinionnaire.

LIMITATIONS

1. This study was focused upon secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and excluded other teacher-coordinators and vocational programs at the secondary level in Mississippi which utilized the cooperative plan of instruction.

2. This study was designed to assess and analyze the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities. No attempt was made to research what was actually being done with regard to recommended coordination activities.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions were used for purposes of this study:

1. Distributive Education: A vocational instructional program designed to meet the needs of persons who have interest in, or are preparing to enter a distributive occupation or an occupation requiring competency in one or more of the marketing functions. It offers instruction in marketing, merchandising, related management, and personal development (Crawford, 1967).

2. Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinator: A member of the local school staff who teaches distributive and related subject matter to students preparing for employment and coordinates classroom instruction with on-the-job training or with occupationally-oriented learning activities of students. He is responsible for the distributive education program in the school (Crawford, 1967).

3. Coordination: The process of organizing, developing, and maintaining relationships among all groups involved in the program to the end that the student receives the best possible preparation for a career in distribution (Crawford and Meyer, 1972). For purposes of this study, coordination involves tasks in nine major categories: selecting student-learners, selecting training stations, developing training agreements, developing training plans, coordinating on-the-job training, controlling students on the job, coordinating related on-the-job instruction, supervising the adult distributive education program, and public relations.

4. Recommended Coordination Activities: For purposes of this study, the term recommended coordination activities was used when
referring to coordination practices, principles, basic beliefs, and critical tasks identified in the following studies:

a. Coordination tasks of the teacher-coordinator identified by Cotrell (1972).

b. Distributive education basic belief statements pertaining to coordination activities (Crawford, 1975).

c. Coordination practices deemed very important or desirable by both employers and distributive education teacher-coordinators (Harris, 1971).


5. Cooperative Vocational Education: . . . a program of vocational education for persons who, through written cooperative arrangements between the school and employers, receive instruction, including required academic courses and related vocational instruction by alternation of study in school with a job in any occupational field, but these two experiences must be planned and supervised by the school and employers so that each contributes to the student's education and to his or her employability (U.S. Congress, 1976, p. 11985).

6. State Supervisor of Distributive Education: A member of the State Department of Education who provides leadership, supervision, and direction to local distributive education teacher-coordinators.

7. Distributive Education Teacher Educator: A member of a college or university staff who is concerned with the professional preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators.

8. Opinion: The term opinion connotes a conclusion or judgment which, while it remains open to dispute, seems true or probable to the respondent's mind. An opinion differs from a belief in that a belief refers to the mental acceptance of an idea or conclusion (Webster's New
World Dictionary). For purposes of this study, secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinator opinion will be regarded as a "syndrome of response consistency from which an underlying predisposition may be inferred" (Lemon, 1967, p. 240).

9. Distributive Occupation: An occupation in which a person is engaged primarily in the marketing or merchandising of goods and services at both management and non-management levels (Crawford, 1967).

10. Basic Beliefs: A statement with which an individual or group agrees or accepts (Edwards, 1957).

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

Vocational education has experienced rapid growth and expansion during the past sixty years. Leaders in vocational education are continually attempting to develop innovative ideas and techniques to help students with the transition from school to the larger social and economic society. Cooperative vocational education is considered to be one of the most effective means of providing for student transition from school to work and enhancing applications of classroom learning.

The purpose of this study was to assess and analyze the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities. The term recommended coordination activities was used when referring to coordination practices and procedures that were identified by major research studies in vocational and distributive education.

The results derived from this study will help state supervisors of distributive education and the distributive education teacher educator
in Mississippi plan and structure selected aspects of both pre-service and in-service cooperative education courses, workshops, and consultative services for secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Chapter two is concerned with a review of related literature and research. Specifically, the chapter contains the following sections: (1) introduction, (2) related literature, (3) related research, (4) opinion measurement, and (5) summary of the chapter.

INTRODUCTION

The success of a nation's economy depends in no small part on the proficiency of its workers. In times past, proficiency was acquired either through personal experience or apprenticeship programs. These two methods have not provided the number of workers and the quality of workmanship required of the present-day labor forces (Roberts, 1971). Programs of vocational education have been established to meet this need for education and training.

Due to the rapidly changing work environment, educational institutions have extended their curricula beyond the classroom, recognizing that the community can provide worthwhile learning activities. Cooperative vocational education has been recognized as one of the most effective means of providing for a controlled occupational laboratory--one which is controlled and supervised by teacher-coordinators to provide educational experiences not obtainable in the school and which remains consonant with the students' career interests.

Cooperative vocational education is an arrangement between the
school and employer in which the student alternates between study in school and work on the job. The definition of cooperative vocational education as defined by the Vocational Act of 1976 is as follows:

... a program of vocational education for persons who, through written cooperative arrangements between the school and employers, receive instruction, including required academic courses and related vocational instruction by alternation of study in school with a job in any occupational field, but these two experiences must be planned and supervised by the school and employers so that each contributes to the student's education and to his or her employability (U.S. Congress, 1976, p. 11985).

There is confusion concerning the difference between cooperative vocational education and work experience education due to the surface resemblance of the programs. One of the first to differentiate between the two educational approaches was the late Louise Bernard, former State Supervisor of Distributive Education in Virginia. She summarized the difference between cooperative vocational education and work experience with regard to the development of occupational competence. She explained that:

Cooperative education is part of our total educational system; young people can rely on it, whereas they cannot always rely on the non-structured programs that merely put them to work . . . . This kind of supervised, coordinated, related training is the most realistic training for the new worker about to enter our complex economy on his own (Mason and Haines, 1965, p. 167).

Cooperative vocational education and work experience programs serve two different sets of purposes; each program utilizes on-the-job experience but organizational, operational, and instructional practices all serve dissimilar purposes (Mason and Haines, 1965). Work experience programs lack the structure and conscious relationship between on-the-job experience and classroom instruction which is the major strength of cooperative vocational education. Quick adaptability to changes in labor market demands also characterize the cooperative vocational educational
program (Evans, 1971).

On-the-job experiences must be planned and supervised by the school and the employer so that each contributes to the student's education and employability. In addition to academic courses, the instruction in school includes job-related instruction that is planned and supervised both in the school and on the job. It is this element of planned vocational experiences both in school and on the job that best distinguishes cooperative vocational education from other plans that combine education and work (Lynch, 1976).

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

A review of related literature was undertaken in order to present portions of the background and supporting literature relative to the effectiveness of cooperative vocational education in bringing about greater relevance of curriculum and instruction. Additionally, this section was included to provide support for the concept that the teacher-coordinator and the functions they perform are vital to the effective operation of cooperative vocational education programs.

Review of Related Literature

Three pieces of legislation provide the basis for activities in vocational education today--the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and the Vocational Act of 1976. The Act of 1963 was spurred by high and persistent levels of youth unemployment and high rates of school dropouts. The Amendments of 1968
stressed services to disadvantaged (rural and urban) and handicapped youth. The Amendments also authorized both school and work programs. The Vocational Act of 1976 stressed comprehensive planning and utilization of community resources to meet the nation's changing technical needs (Harrison Williams, U.S. Senator, New Jersey, 1976).

Vocational education has traditionally utilized the resources of the community to bring about greater relevance of curriculum and instruction (Swanson, 1971). The cooperative plan of instruction was designed to provide for a relevant curriculum and related instruction for students with vocational goals (Meyer, Crawford, and Klaurens, 1975).

Ralph Tyler (1971) explained that through cooperative education students are able to find meaning and relevance in their studies:

... because the theories and principles learned in the classroom are reinforced and given concrete application on work assignments and because they increasingly perceive, as their experience continues, the relevance of what they are studying to the situations they encounter while on the job (p. 19).

Pucinski (1969) stated that: "by blending a meaningful job experience with related educational courses, cooperative programs are ideally suited to bring relevancy to our schools" (p. 6). Cooperative vocational education serves to remove the barrier between what is learned in school and what is learned outside of school. "Cooperative vocational education is an interdependent combination of vocational instruction and employment related to that instruction" (Madden, 1973, p. 5).

Cooperative vocational education is one of the avenues through which relevancy has been retained in our nation's schools. Meyer, Crawford, and Klaurens (1975) note that "cooperative vocational education has some built-in features that almost ensure relevant instruction."
These salient features are:

1. Students are placed on jobs that are in harmony with their abilities and interests.

2. Each student follows a plan of on-the-job experience which is based on occupational requirements and individual student needs.

3. Students have the opportunity to learn skills on real jobs under actual working conditions.

4. Classroom instruction, on-the-job training, and student club activities are articulated in the development of clearly identified competencies.

5. Students are able to identify with the world of work in a meaningful way.

6. Students receive the guidance of trained teacher-coordinators who have had wide experience in the occupational field when making vital vocational decisions.

7. Students make the transition from school to work gradually under the skilled guidance of a teacher-coordinator, giving them time to comprehend the significance of the learning situation and the world of work (p. 17-18).

Grant Venn (1970) made several important recommendations concerning cooperative vocational education. He recommended that work experience be integrated as part of the methodology for education and should be required of all students. Further, he recommended that cooperative vocational education be expanded as a major learning method in occupational preparation, and that there should be a high degree of cooperation between the school and the community.

Wilson (1971) made the assertion that:

... data available about the impact of cooperative education suggests ... cooperative education makes a strong contribution to the growth of the individual student in his personal development, his social development, and his career development (p. 15).

According to Borow (1969), cooperative vocational education strengthens the vocational maturity of the student by allowing the
student to:

1. Learn the characteristic skills, duties, and practical understandings associated with the occupation to which he is assigned through a training station.

2. Acquire what we may call a work ethos, a set of attitudes, rules of etiquette, and interpersonal skills involving relations with fellow workers, supervisors, and clients.

3. Better know what manner of person he is—what strengths, limitations, aspirations, and personal values characterize him (p. 3).

A basic concept associated with all cooperative vocational education programs is the employment of a teacher-coordinator trained in coordination techniques. The teacher-coordinator must have had experience in the vocational field in which he/she will instruct and guide the student-learner. Teacher coordinators are considered to be the "back bone" of effective cooperative vocational education programs (Taylor, 1975). Kaufman (1967), Loyd (1969), Helling (1965), Huffman (1967), Wallace (1970), and Lesh (1966), have determined characteristics of the effective teacher-coordinator:

1. Shows initiative in promoting and administering a cooperative program.

2. Creates and maintains good public relations with students, school personnel, parents, and the community.

3. Is dynamic, and willing to expend effort and energy beyond the minimum required.

Bikkie, Eggland, and Zikmund (1972) stated that the teacher-coordinator is a vital aspect of cooperative vocational education. The authors emphasized that the teacher-coordinator and the functions they perform are the heart of a cooperative program. They state that by
strengthening the teacher-coordinator, the cooperative program is correspondingly strengthened.

Coordination is one of the most important responsibilities assumed by the teacher-coordinator (Seaverns, 1970). In the role of coordinator, this person is responsible for selecting student-learners, selecting training stations, development of training agreements, development of training plans, coordination of on-the-job training, student control on the job, and coordinating related on-the-job instruction.

**Summary**

The review of related literature revealed several important factors concerning the cooperative plan of instruction. A common theme throughout states that cooperative vocational education combines formal instruction with learning on the job and that cooperative vocational education should be made available to all who desire it. From a review of the literature in this section, it was concluded that:


3. Teacher-coordinators who are trained in coordination techniques are essential to the effective operation of cooperative vocational education programs (Taylor, 1975; Bikkie, Eggland, and Zikmund, 1972; and Seaverns, 1970).
Introduction

A review of related research was undertaken to assist in justifying the importance, rationale, organization, and design of this study. Specifically, the review of related research was focused upon studies which identified coordination procedures and guidelines relative to the effective operation of cooperative vocational education programs.

Review of Related Research

Warmke (1960) and Weatherford (1972) analyzed the opinions of distributive education leaders concerning issues in distributive education and the importance of these issues in determining effective operating procedures in distributive education. The issues were identified by a literature review and interviews with distributive educators. These studies established several principles in distributive education with regard to coordination (Appendix C).

Cotrell (1972) conducted a study to determine the critical tasks of teacher-coordinators of secondary-level cooperative vocational education programs in six vocational fields. Forty-seven critical tasks pertaining to coordination were identified through application of occupational analysis techniques (Appendix E). A critical task was defined as a statement of observable behavior which describes what a person will be doing as he/she functions in the teacher-coordinators role. To determine if gaps had occurred in the listing of critical tasks, interviews and literature reviews were utilized to verify the information obtained through occupational analysis. A three-hundred member national task
force rated these critical tasks to determine their importance to the success of cooperative vocational education teacher-coordinators. An analysis of those ratings indicated that a majority (91.8 percent) of the critical tasks were important to at least five of the six cooperative vocational education programs that were studied and therefore were labeled common elements.

Harris (1971) conducted a study to determine employer preferences and teacher-coordinator practices as they relate to the organization and operation of cooperative-plan distributive education programs at the secondary school level. Specifically, the study sought answers to the following selected questions:

1. How important are selected operational and teacher-coordinator activities to the success of cooperative-plan distributive education programs?

2. What proportion of coordination time is devoted to selected activities?

3. What are the reasons for business participation in the cooperative distributive education program?

4. What techniques used by teacher-coordinators for securing training stations do employers find most effective in gaining the participation of their firms? What is the relationship between those techniques and the ones actually used by teacher-coordinators?

5. What is the relationship between the practices of various groups of teacher-coordinators and the following classification data: location and type of school, years of experience as a coordinator, utilization of advisory committees, and utilization of training plans (p. 3)?

Based upon analysis of the data, Harris (1971) recommended the following as essential operational activities of the cooperative plan of instruction:

1. A schedule developed by the coordinator and training sponsor
for training each student.

2. Training session to prepare training sponsors for their role in training distributive education students.

3. Classroom instruction having a relationship to the learning experiences of a student in his training stations.

4. Training materials for the student to study in school, which are related to his training-station experiences.

5. A written training agreement that establishes the responsibilities of student, school, and employer.

6. Teacher-coordinators should place increased emphasis on the following three elements of the cooperative plan: training plans, advisory committees, and training sponsors.

7. Teacher-coordinators should devote proportionately more of their coordination time to the implementation of on-the-job training plans and to the solution of students' on-the-job problems.

8. Placement activities must include a review of the competencies and personal characteristics possessed by the students in relation to the particular expectations of employers (p. 47).

Crawford's (1967) study entitled "A Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Teacher Education," attempted to determine the learning experiences that should be included in a distributive teacher education program (both pre-service and in-service). The competency pattern consisted of four major elements: a philosophy of distributive education, the critical tasks of the distributive education teacher-coordinator in relation to the philosophy, the professional competencies that a distributive education teacher-coordinator needs to perform these tasks, and the technical competencies needed by the teacher-coordinator to develop the competencies needed by distributive workers to enter and advance in a distributive occupation.

The philosophy of distributive education was constructed by identifying and validating basic beliefs. Statements representing potential
basic beliefs were drawn from the literature and research in distributive and vocational education and a card-sort composed of ninety-six statements, each of which was an hypothesis, was constructed and tested. This structured card-sort representing basic beliefs of distributive education became the foundation upon which the other elements of the study were based.

The philosophy of distributive education was first constructed by Crawford (1967) and revalidated by her in 1975. The philosophy of distributive education contains basic beliefs regarding distributive education as it "ought to be" (Crawford, 1967, p. 1). Those basic beliefs from the 1975 study concerning coordination practices and procedures are listed in Appendix F.

Dorr (1962) conducted a national survey to determine the weaknesses of cooperative-plan distributive education teacher-coordinators. Forty-one cases were reviewed of which twenty-seven (sixty percent) involved weaknesses in the coordination phase of total program operation. The identified weaknesses in this category were: (1) lack of planned coordination calls, (2) lack of ability to develop a good working relationship with the training sponsor in the coordination phase of program operation, (3) lack of orientation of training sponsor regarding his responsibilities, (4) permitting students to find their own training sponsors, (5) acceptance of inferior training stations, and (6) ineffective screening of students. Dorr's study pointed out specific weaknesses in coordination, but no attempt was made to establish priorities for coordination activities or to relate the weaknesses to specific sociological or demographic variables.

Samson (1964) conducted a study to determine the performance
requirements of secondary distributive education teacher-coordinators. He employed the critical-incident technique using student-learners, training sponsors, supervising school administrators, and co-worker faculty members as observers. He derived 127 critical requirements for distributive education teacher-coordinators and classified the critical requirements into the following five major categories:

1. Student discipline and control
2. Administration and operation of the program
3. Instructional activities
4. Coordination
5. Personal and professional relationships

Samson (1964) concluded that:

... performance requirements should be valuable in meeting preservice and in-service education needs of teacher-coordinators, the development of evaluative instruments for use by supervisors and administrators, teacher-coordinator self-evaluation, and in identifying researchable hypotheses within several areas of teacher-coordinator responsibilities (p. 123).

Harris (1965) conducted a study to determine the critical requirements for office education and distributive education teacher-coordinators. Initial classification procedures resulted in the following eight major categories of job activities for secondary distributive education teacher-coordinators:

1. Discipline and control of students
2. Selection of training station and placement activities
3. Evaluation and selection of students
4. Personal and professional relationships
5. Adjusting student training station performance problems
Critical requirements were then developed from the critical behaviors reported by teacher-coordinators and supervising school administrators. The critical behaviors were then analyzed to ascertain whether certain relationships between the behaviors reported and socio-demographic data were significantly different from the relationships that would exist if chance factors alone were involved. Harris (1965) then reported that:

Significant differences were found in the patterns of behavior of distributive education teacher-coordinators when compared with the factors of educational preparation, years of experience as coordinators in their present schools. Coordinators who had earned Master's degrees . . . had a significantly greater number of effective behaviors than did coordinators who lacked this specific type of preparation (p. 75).

Based upon analysis of the data, Harris (1965) recommended the following to facilitate pre-service and in-service preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators:

1. The critical requirements of . . . distributive education teacher-coordinators are worthy of consideration by teacher educators and other officials who are responsible for developing in-service education programs for employed coordinators.

2. The critical requirements of . . . distributive education teacher-coordinators are useful as a point of departure in the development of evaluative instruments for the performance of . . . distributive education coordinators (p. 84-85).

He further recommended that studies be conducted to "determine the relationships which exist between the occupational experience of teacher-coordinators and their behavior" (p. 86).
Summary

This section provided the basis for a thorough review of those research studies designed to identify the coordination functions of the teacher-coordinator as they relate to the effective operation of cooperative distributive education programs. As a result of a review of the research studies in this section, the researcher was able to identify potential statements pertaining to recommended coordination activities. It was concluded that the identified coordination activities serve as an aid in identifying and designing learning activities for students and to assist the student in achieving his/her goals.

OPINION MEASUREMENT

Introduction

This section was included in order to present a review of research studies related to the assessment and analysis of opinion. This investigator perceived that a review of research studies involving opinion measurement and its relationship to behavior was a prerequisite in preparation for the research effort. This section was intended to provide support for the hypothesis that prior behavioral commitment toward recommended coordination activities increases correspondence between opinion and behavior.

Review of Opinion Research

According to Newcomb, Turner, and Converse (1965), the Likert scale may come closest to the identification of an individual's attitude or opinion through the use of a positive-negative attitude continuum. The Likert scale requires an individual to indicate the direction and
degree of affect he/she feels concerning an object, event, or possible state of affairs. A Likert scale used in an opinionnaire is a scale in which the interval between each point on the scale is assumed to be equal and the respondent is instructed to circle the letter indicating his/her opinion (Tuckman, 1972).

The combining of responses to a number of items or into single summaries or categories produces an "attitude scale." This method of combining an individual's response toward specific aspects of the same object would provide a reliable indication of the individual's generalized attitude or opinion toward that common object (Newcomb, Turner, and Converse, 1965).

According to Lemon (1973), the relationship between attitude and opinion is an analogous one in which there are no clear guidelines on which distinctions can be based. Hovland, Janis, and Kelley (1953) defined attitude as a more global concept than opinion, advocating that attitude be used to characterize a general orientation and opinion a more specific predisposition. Thurstone (1931) stated that opinion is simply a manifestation of an attitude, and that opinions can therefore be used to diagnose underlying predisposition. Cooper and McGaugh (1963) distinguished between opinion and attitude on the grounds that opinion is rather more tentative than attitudes and deals with matters of fact which are verifiable, while attitude is concerned with matters of taste or with normative material.

A study by Tittle and Hill (1967) compared the effectiveness of five different types of attitude measurement in predicting behavior and they were able to demonstrate differences in efficiency between the
different types of measure. Three types of attitude scales (Likert, Thurstone and Guttman) were used together with a semantic differential measure and a simple self-rating scale. The results indicated that the best prediction of behavior, as measured over the five indices, was accomplished by the Likert scale.

Studies conducted by Green (1969) and Fendrich (1967) dealing with racial attitudes and behavior provides support for the hypothesis that prior behavioral commitment increases the correspondence between attitude measures and behavior. This hypothesis is further supported by a study conducted by Kamenetsky, Burgess, and Rowan (1956) in which respondents completed an attitude questionnaire dealing with past unknowingly observed behavior. They argue that behavior serves as a valuable cue to the respondent in completing a questionnaire.

Self-report attitude or opinion measures ask the respondent to tell the investigator what his/her attitude is, and they provide him with a set of procedures to facilitate this task. According to Lemon (1973) there are two ways in which the researcher may regard data from this type of source.

1. He may assume that such data gives him information about his respondent's inner states, i.e., about his feelings and the way in which he perceives the attitude object.

2. He may assume that responses from self-report measures do not differ substantially from any other form of behavior (p. 240).

Lemon (1973), further stated that:

... what we know of individuals propensities to achieve consistency between their own cognitions leads us to expect consistency between attitudes and behavior (p. 244).

Campbell (1963) noted that:
Where a respondent is diagnosed by an investigator to have a particular view of the world, one should be able to translate this into a tendency to make particular responses to certain stimuli. Similarly, if a respondent is observed to behave in characteristic ways, then in principle it is quite feasible to say that he does this because he sees things in particular ways (p. 241).

Bem (1965, 1967) proposed that individuals infer their opinions, to some degree, from their behavior. He suggested that in assessing opinions, people perform a sort of behavioral inventory, asking themselves what their past behavior seems to imply about their opinions. Bem's view is that respondents are observing their behavior and inferring their opinions from it: "If I behaved in that way, then my opinion must be consistent with the behavior" (p. 239).

Summary

From a review of the research studies presented in this section, it was concluded that:


2. Individuals infer their opinions, to some degree, from their behavior (Campbell, 1963; Bem, 1965, 1967; Green, 1969; and Fendrich, 1967).


SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

Due to the rapidly changing work environment, educational institutions are seeking to extend their curricula beyond the classroom to utilize community resources to meet our nation's changing technical needs. Vocational education has historically utilized the resources of the community as a basis for the development of relevant curricula and instruction for students with vocational goals. Cooperative vocational education has been recognized as one of the most effective means of providing for relevant curricula and instruction.

Teacher-coordinators and the coordination functions they perform are considered to be a vital component with regard to the effective operation of cooperative vocational education programs. Those coordination practices and procedures teacher-coordinators should perform have surfaced largely as a result of research in cooperative vocational education.

This chapter was concerned with a review of related literature and research in cooperative vocational education and opinion measurement in order to present and review studies which contributed to the rationale, organization, and design of this study.
Chapter III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Chapter three is concerned with design and methodology. Specifically, the chapter contains the following sections: (1) statement of the problem, (2) research questions, (3) population of the study, (4) opinionnaire development, (5) data collection procedure, (6) data treatment and statistical analysis, and (7) summary of the chapter.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The central purpose of this study was to assess and analyze the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators employed in the state of Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities. Additionally, this study was designed to examine the relationship between selected demographic variables and opinion toward recommended coordination activities. Those demographic variables were:

1. Years of teaching experience as a secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinator.
2. Type of undergraduate degree held and major field of study.
3. Type of graduate degree held and area of concentration.
4. Occupational experience.
5. The number of completed hours of undergraduate vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators.
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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Specifically, answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. What are the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities?

2. Does a relationship exist between the number of years of teaching experience of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?

3. Does a relationship exist between the number of years of occupational experience of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?

4. Does a relationship exist between the type of undergraduate degree held by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?

5. Does a relationship exist between the type of graduate degree held by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?

6. Does a relationship exist between the number of completed hours of undergraduate vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities?
POPULATION OF THE STUDY

This study was concerned with selected demographic characteristics and opinions of a single population—secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in the state of Mississippi employed during the 1976-77 school year. The total population of fifty-two secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators were included in this study.

OPINIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

The opinionnaire method was chosen as a means of data collection. Opinionnaires provide for mass coverage of potential respondents, complete standardization of the instructions to which the respondents are exposed, and provide the researcher with flexibility in the nature of the information sought (Fox, 1969). Additional advantages of the opinionnaire as noted by Kerlinger (1973) are:

... greater uniformity of stimulus and thus greater reliability can be achieved. In this respect, it has the advantages of objective-type, written tests and scales. A secondary advantage is that, if anonymous, honesty and frankness may be encouraged (p. 487).

Review of Research and Literature

A review of the literature failed to reveal an available instrument with which to assess distributive education teacher-coordinator opinion toward recommended coordination activities. The review also revealed a lack of studies investigating the attitudes and opinions of secondary distributive education teacher-coordinators toward recommended
coordination activities. Therefore, it was necessary to construct an opinionnaire using statements representing recommended coordination activities. The inventory of statements representing recommended coordination activities was developed from a review of the literature with emphasis placed on five research studies--Crawford (1975), Weatherford (1972), Cotrell (1972), Harris (1971), and Warmke (1960).

Two of the research studies--Warmke (1960), and Weatherford (1972)--were concerned with issues in distributive education. The purpose of these studies was to identify major issues in distributive education and to ascertain the opinion of distributive education leaders toward those issues. Issue statements pertaining to coordination practices that received a clear consensus of opinion (67 to 90 percent) from leaders in distributive education were reviewed for use in opinionnaire development (Appendix C).

Harris (1971) conducted a study to determine employer preferences and teacher-coordinator practices as they relate to the organization and operation of cooperative-plan distributive education programs at the secondary level. Statements pertaining to the importance of coordination activities that were rated by both employers and distributive education teacher-coordinators as being either very important or desirable were reviewed for use in opinionnaire development (Appendix D).

Cotrell (1972) conducted a teacher-coordinator task analysis study based on the opinion of three hundred experts, fifty from each of six established vocational fields. The study revealed 385 tasks that were divided into ten categories and eighty-two clusters. Those forty-seven tasks and eleven clusters that related to coordination were reviewed
for use in opinionnaire development (Appendix E).

The philosophy of distributive education was first constructed by Crawford (1967) and revalidated in 1975. Basic belief statements were drawn from the literature and research in vocational education and structured with reviews by a committee of consultants. A basic belief card-sort composed of basic belief statements, each of which was an hypothesis, was constructed and submitted to one hundred fifty-three state supervisory and teacher education personnel. Those basic belief statements concerning coordination were reviewed for use in opinionnaire development (Appendix F).

The above studies which dealt with issues, tasks, practices, and basic beliefs of coordination provided the basis for the conceptualization and design of the opinionnaire which would elicit the necessary responses from secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi.

Identification of Statements of Recommended Coordination Activities and Categories of Coordination Activities

Initially, thirty-three coordination activities were extracted from the Cotrell (1972) study; eight additional coordination activities were identified as a result of reviewing the Warmke (1960), Weatherford (1972), Harris (1971) and Crawford (1975) studies. The panel of experts recommended that four additional coordination activities be included in the opinionnaire; five coordination activities were added to the opinionnaire as a result of recommendations made by pilot-test members.

For purposes of this study, the opinionnaire and the inventory
of statements representing recommended coordination activities contained nine major categories of coordination activities. They were: (1) selecting students, (2) selecting training stations, (3) developing training agreements, (4) developing training plans, (5) coordination of on-the-job training, (6) student control, (7) related on-the-job instruction, (8) adult distributive education, and (9) public relations. The basis for the selection of the first seven categories of coordination activities was the coordination clusters identified in the Cotrell (1972) study. Adult distributive education, the eighth category of coordination activities, was added as a result of recommendations made by the panel of experts. Public relations, the ninth category of coordination activities, was added as a result of pilot-testing the opinionnaire. The categories of coordination activities and recommended coordination activities within each category are contained in Appendix G.

Panel of Experts

According to Oppenheim (1960), a panel of experts should be selected to agree upon the content validity of statements in an opinionnaire. He further stated that content validity is of essence and necessarily based on judgment. The panel members were chosen because of individual experience and expertise in distributive education. Two state supervisors of distributive education, two distributive teacher educators, and two distributive education teacher-coordinators represented the panel of experts (Appendix H). The panel received a cover letter accompanying the opinionnaire which explained the design of the study, the rationale for the study, and the basis for selection of the inventory of statements.
Content Validity

Content validity is easily determined on Likert scales according to Sax (1974). He explains that "items can be rewritten and revised until raters (panel of experts) agree that they are clear and unambiguous" (p. 434). Content validity was obtained by having the panel of experts review the opinionnaire and provide written evaluations. The panel also provided comments on clarity, design and format, and discreteness of the inventory of statements representing recommended coordination activities (Appendix J). No changes were recommended with respect to clarity, design and format, and discreteness of the inventory of statements included in the opinionnaire. The panel of experts recommended that one category of coordination activities and five additional coordination activities pertaining to adult distributive education be added to the opinionnaire.

Pilot Testing of the Opinionnaire

Five secondary distributive education teacher-coordinators in Virginia were selected and asked to participate in the pilot testing of the opinionnaire (Appendix K). The pilot-test members received a cover letter accompanying the opinionnaire which explained the study, the rationale, and the basis for selection of the inventory of statements (Appendix L). Wiersma (1975) notes that:

> The group need not be a random sample of prospective respondents, but the members of the group should be familiar with the variables under study and should be in a position to make valid judgments about the items (p. 141).

The primary purpose of the pilot test was to identify
misunderstandings, useless or inadequate items, and to determine if any important coordination activities had been omitted from the opinionnaire. As a result of pilot-testing the opinionnaire, the public relations category and four additional coordination activities pertaining to public relations were added to the final opinionnaire.

Development of the Final Opinionnaire

All appropriate recommendations provided by the panel of experts and pilot-test members were incorporated into the final form of the opinionnaire which contained fifty items and consisted of two sections (Appendix M). Section one was concerned with the collection of demographic data from the participants. The information that was sought pertained to:

1. The number of years of teaching experience as a secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinator.

2. The type of undergraduate degree held and major field of study.

3. The number of years of occupational experience in a distributive occupation.

4. The type of graduate degree held and area of concentration.

5. The number of completed hours of undergraduate vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators.

The Mississippi distributive education state supervisory staff and distributive teacher educator were instrumental in determining the respondent demographic characteristics to be assessed in section one of the
opinionnaire.

Section two contained statements which attempted to examine the respondent's opinions toward recommended coordination activities. A four-point Likert scale was used to alleviate the tendency of respondents to choose the mid-point of a scale and specific criteria were developed to describe each point on the scale. The possible choices for each point on the scale and their interpretation were:

1. **Agree**: This is a coordination activity which, in my opinion, is **very important** to the operation of the cooperative distributive education program (i.e., this should be the generally accepted practice in **almost all** circumstances related to this coordination activity).

2. **Tend to Agree**: This is a coordination activity which, in my opinion, is of **considerable importance** to the operation of the cooperative distributive education program (i.e., this should be the practice in **most** circumstances related to this coordination activity).

3. **Tend to Disagree**: This is a coordination activity which, in my opinion, is of **little importance** to the operation of the cooperative distributive education program (i.e., this coordination activity is **seldom** appropriate).

4. **Disagree**: This is a coordination activity which, in my opinion, is of **no importance** to the operation of the cooperative distributive education program (i.e., this coordination activity is, under **no circumstances, applicable**).
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

Prior to receiving the opinionnaire, potential respondents received a letter from the State Supervisor of Distributive Education in Mississippi, requesting that they participate in the study (Appendix N). A cover letter, which was signed by the researcher's committee chairman and the researcher, accompanied the initial mailing of the opinionnaire and explained the purpose and value of the survey (Appendix O). Potential respondents were assured that their replies would remain anonymous and confidential. However, a coding system was devised to identify non-response participants.

A personal telephone call was made to all non-respondents two weeks after mailing the original opinionnaire. A second opinionnaire, cover letter, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope was mailed to those teacher-coordinators who indicated that they had not received or had misplaced the original opinionnaire. Ninety-three percent of the fifty-two opinionnaires were returned after three weeks. These forty-eight opinionnaires provided the researcher with an adequate representation of raw data. As Wiersma (1975) notes: "generally 75 percent is considered a good rate of return" (p. 144).

DATA TREATMENT AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

A four-part Likert-type scale was used in this study to assess teacher-coordinator opinion. Borg (1963) contended that in cases where investigators wish to measure an attitude or opinion for which no scale is available "the Likert technique is usually the easiest method of
developing scales" (p. 110). The Likert-type scale yields numerical scores which are measured on an ordinal scale (Englehart, 1972).

A Likert-type scale was selected which allowed the respondents to indicate disagreement or agreement with each of the statements through four degrees of response. Numerical values ranged from one to four, i.e., the "agree" response was assigned the value of four; the "tend to agree" response was assigned the value of three; the "tend to disagree" response was assigned the value of two; and the "disagree" response was assigned the value of one.

Upon completion of data collection, the data were coded, transferred to optical scanner sheets, key punched, and verified for processing. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), an integrated system of computer programs designed for the analysis of social science data, was used to facilitate analysis of the data.

Descriptive statistics (composite means and standard deviations) were computed for each recommended coordination activity and category of coordination activities for the total population and for each respondent group according to selected demographic characteristics. Recommended coordination activities and categories of coordination activities were then ranked accordingly for the total population and for each respondent group.

To compare respondent group rankings, the Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient was employed to determine the degree of similarity or dissimilarity of the rankings of coordination categories. Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficients range from +1.00 (maximum positive)
to -1.00 (maximum negative). When the correlation coefficient is maximum positive (+1.00), the difference between rankings is equal to zero. When the correlation coefficient is maximum negative (-1.00), the difference between rankings is maximum. The main use of the Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient is to test the hypothesis of zero correlation between rankings (Wyatt and Bridges, 1967). The Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient was used as a measure of the similarity of rankings and no inferences about absolute coordination category scores or the importance of coordination categories was inferred.

In addition to observed differences between composite opinion mean scores, the t-test was used as an additional measure to determine whether or not respondent group composite opinion mean scores were significantly different or to determine if the similarity was so close that there was a reasonable probability that the respondent group composite mean scores did not differ. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Subprogram T-Test was used to make this comparison.

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The materials and methods described in this chapter were designed to assess and analyze selected demographic characteristics and the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities.

The opinionnaire was designed by utilizing a panel of experts and pilot-testing with distributive education teacher-coordinators before final utilization with the selected population. The final opinionnaire contained fifty statements representing recommended coordination
activities.

Descriptive statistics (composite opinion mean scores and standard deviations), Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficients, and t-tests were then used to assess and analyze the responses of the total population as well as the similarities and differences of opinion with respect to demographic characteristics.
Chapter IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

Chapter four is concerned with the presentation of data and data analysis. Specifically, the chapter contains the following sections: (1) descriptive data of population, (2) data treatment, (3) major findings, and (4) summary of the chapter.

DESCRIPTIVE DATA OF POPULATION

A total of forty-eight secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators marked and returned the opinionnaire in useable form. This represented ninety-three percent of the total number of opinionnaires distributed.

Initial analysis required the researcher to categorize the demographic data with respect to the following: (1) beginning distributive education teacher-coordinators (three years or less of experience), (2) experienced distributive education teacher-coordinators (four or more years of experience), (3) occupational experience (two years or less of full or part-time vs. more than two years of full or part-time experience), (4) type of undergraduate degree held, (5) type of graduate degree held, and (6) the number of completed hours of undergraduate vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators.

Thirty-five percent (N=17) of the respondents had three years or less of teaching experience and sixty-five percent (N=31) had four or
more years of experience as secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators. Seventy-five percent (N=36) of the respondents indicated that they had less than two years of occupational experience either full or part-time. Twenty-five percent (N=12) of the respondents reported more than two years of experience, either full or part-time, in a distributive occupation. Of the total number of respondents (N=48), twenty-three percent (N=11) indicated having undergraduate degrees in distributive education. Fifty-two percent of the total population (N=25) indicated having undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining service areas in vocational education; fifteen of those respondents (60 percent) indicated having an undergraduate degree in business education. Six percent (N=3) of the respondents indicated having an undergraduate degree in business and nineteen percent (N=9) indicated having an undergraduate degree in the "other" category.

Sixty-nine percent (N=33) of the respondents did not possess a Master's degree; sixty-one percent (N=20) of those respondents indicated completing at least nine hours of undergraduate vocational education course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators. Thirty-nine percent (N=13) indicated that they had completed less than nine hours of undergraduate vocational education course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators.

Thirty-one percent (N=15) of the respondents held Master's degrees; eleven of those respondents (73 percent) indicated that they had completed at least twelve hours of graduate instruction designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators and four
(27 percent) indicated that they had completed no courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators. Refer to Table 1 for further examination of this data.

DATA TREATMENT

A mean score of "3.50 - 4.00" for each recommended coordination activity or category of coordination activities indicated that the coordination activity or category of activities was very important. This means that the coordination activity or category was considered to be the generally accepted practice in almost all circumstances. A mean score of "2.50 - 3.49" for each recommended coordination activity or category of coordination activities indicated that the coordination activity or category was of considerable importance. This means that the coordination activity or category was practiced in most circumstances. A mean score of "1.50 - 2.49" for each recommended coordination activity or category of coordination activities indicated that the coordination activity or category was of little importance. This means that the coordination activity or category was seldom appropriate.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Research Question Number One

What are the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities? The general nature of the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities is reported in Tables 2 and 3.
TABLE 1
POPULATION DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population N=48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Teaching Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Beginning DE teacher-coordinators (three years or less of experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Experienced DE teacher-coordinators (four or more years of experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Occupational Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Two years or less of occupational experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. More than two years of occupational experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Distributive Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Vocational Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Master's degree with emphasis in DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Master's degree in other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Number of Completed Hours of Undergraduate Course Work Designed Specifically to Train DE Teacher-Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Completion of at least nine hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Completed less than nine hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed in Table 2 are the mean scores, standard deviations, and rankings for the fifty coordination activities. The coordination activity "Prepare student-learner for interview with cooperating employer and training station personnel," was ranked number one by the total population with an opinion mean score of 3.60. The coordination activity "Assist students in the solution of problems related to on-the-job training," was ranked number two by the total population with an opinion mean score of 3.56. The lowest opinion mean score (2.52) was for the coordination activity "Provide vocational guidance and counseling for adults who need training or retraining for a distributive occupation." Of the fifty coordination activities included in this study, six (12 percent) were considered to be very important and forty-four (88 percent) of the coordination activities were considered to be of considerable importance.

Listed in Table 3 are the mean scores, standard deviations, and rankings for the nine major categories of coordination activities for the total population of teacher-coordinators included in this study. The coordination category "Developing Training Agreements" was ranked number one by the total population with a category mean score of 3.49. The coordination category "Selecting Training Stations" was ranked number two by the total population with a category mean score of 3.31. The coordination category "Adult Distributive Education" was ranked number nine by the total population with a category mean score of 2.81. The nine major categories of coordination activities were ranked by the total population as being of considerable importance.
TABLE 2
OPINION MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANKINGS OF RECOMMENDED COORDINATION ACTIVITIES BY SECONDARY COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHER-COORDINATORS IN MISSISSIPPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Coordination Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gather student-learner selection data (i.e., standardized test results, attendance records, grades).</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prepare and issue news releases which describe various program activities.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Match a student-learner's unique characteristics with an appropriate training station.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Allow for at least thirty minutes of coordination time per week per student (i.e., for twenty (20) students, you should spend approximately ten (10) hours per week coordinating).</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maintain membership in a community civic or service organization.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide workshops to assist the on-the-job instructor (training sponsor) with techniques for training student-learners.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Interview parents prior to student-learner selection.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Develop a systematic training plan for each student-learner after conference with the student-learner and training sponsor.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Determine adult instructional needs for employees in distributive occupations at various levels of responsibility.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Coordination Activity</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Arrange school and work schedules with student-learners, school administrators, and training station personnel.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Construct displays in the business community which promote the goals and purposes of distributive education.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Record, in a training plan, the progress, knowledge, and skills mastered by each student-learner.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Inform the local school administration of daily coordination itinerary.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Establish criteria to evaluate qualifications of prospective on-the-job instructors.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Assess student-learner progress on the job to determine appropriate training experiences and related classroom assignments.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Conduct a community survey to identify potential training stations.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Approve on-the-job training hours and wages for the student-learner.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Establish criteria for evaluating training station potential.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Assist the cooperating employer's personnel in accepting the training status and role of the student-learner.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Provide formal and informal recognition to employers and on-the-job instructors.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Coordination Activity</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Develop related instruction for student-learners on the basis of information obtained from employers.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Administer occupational inventories to assist the student-learner in the determination of potential career interests.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Obtain suggestions from on-the-job instructor to guide the development of related class instruction.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Provide vocational guidance and counseling for adults who need training or retraining for a distributive occupation.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Assess the training capability of the on-the-job instructors.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Visit each employer every two or three weeks to discuss the performance and progress of each student-learner.</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. List the skills and related knowledge in a training plan to be mastered by the student-learner.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Aid the student-learner in procuring a work permit.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Develop a procedure to insure student safety and protection at the training station.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Provide information regarding adult education offerings available in the community.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Assess the student-learner's on-the-job performance with assistance of the on-the-job instructor.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Coordination Activity</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Control the transfer of student-learners within the cooperative program and to other school programs.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Assist students in the solution of problems related to on-the-job training.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Offer assistance to merchants who are encountering problems associated with their business.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Assist an employer in verifying the legality of employing a student-learner in a hazardous occupation.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Develop a cooperative training agreement between student-learner, parents, school, and cooperating employer.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Maintain student-learner progress record forms for on-the-job training and related instruction.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Maintain a weekly wage and hour report for all cooperative students.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Define in the training plan, the student-learners responsibility for personal conduct and performance in keeping with his/her career objective.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Interview students to determine student-learner interest and aptitude for a career in marketing and distribution.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Encourage the employer to provide a wide variety of experiences associated with an occupation.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Coordination Activity</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the on-the-job instructor with developing of training procedures appropriate for cooperative students.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodically review the training plan with the employer and student-learner.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify potential instructors for adult distributive education courses.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select training stations for their education value to the student-learner.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist student-learner in on-the-job training orientation.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish criteria for selection of student-learners.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide prospective student-learners with career orientation materials to aid them in selecting a vocation.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare student-learner for interview with cooperating employer and training station personnel.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact the on-the-job instructor and make an appointment prior to the coordination visit.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Category</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Agreements</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Training Stations</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Students</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Control</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of On-The-Job Training</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Plans</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related On-The-Job Instruction</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Distributive Education</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Number Two

Does a relationship exist between the number of years of teaching experience of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities? A composite opinion mean score of 3.33 was computed for beginning distributive education teacher-coordinators (three years or less of experience) with regard to their overall opinion toward recommended coordination activities. A composite opinion mean score of 3.11 was computed for experienced distributive education teacher-coordinators (four or more years of experience) with regard to their overall opinion toward recommended coordination activities.

Beginning distributive education teacher-coordinators ranked the coordination categories "Developing Training Agreements" (3.70) and "Selecting Training Stations" (3.51) as first and second respectively with regard to their overall opinion. Experienced distributive education teacher-coordinators ranked the coordination categories "Developing Training Agreements" (3.37) and "Selecting Students" (3.22) as first and second respectively with regard to their overall opinion. Both beginning and experienced distributive education teacher-coordinators ranked "Related on-the-job Training" and "Adult Distributive Education" as eighth and ninth respectively out of nine major categories of coordination activities. The greatest dissimilarity between the rankings of the two groups occurred in the "Selecting Students" and "Student Control" categories. A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .68 was computed as a measure of the overall similarity between the rankings of coordination categories between beginning and experienced distributive
education teacher-coordinators in the state of Mississippi.

Experienced distributive education teacher-coordinators rated the nine major categories of coordination activities as being of considerable importance to the effective operation of cooperative distributive education programs. Beginning distributive education teacher-coordinators rated two of the nine major categories of coordination activities as being very important and six categories of coordination activities as being of considerable importance.

The t-test to determine the difference between respondent group composite opinion mean scores indicated that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi differed significantly (beyond the .05 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon years of teaching experience (three or less vs. four or more). Refer to Table 4 for a complete examination of coordination category mean scores, standard deviations, Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient, and t-test results.

Research Question Number Three

Does a relationship exist between the number of years of occupational experience of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities? Composite opinion mean scores were computed for Mississippi distributive education teacher-coordinators according to the following categories: (1) two years or less of occupational experience, and (2) more than two years of occupational experience. A composite opinion mean score of 2.89 was computed for those teacher-coordinators with two
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Category</th>
<th>N=17 Beginning</th>
<th></th>
<th>N=31 Experienced</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Students</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related On-The-Job Instruction</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Control</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Distributive Education</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of On-The-Job Training</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Agreements</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Plans</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Training Stations</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Opinion Mean Score</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rho: .68  
T-test Results: Significant (p<.05)
years or less of occupational experience. A composite opinion mean score of 3.45 was computed for those teacher-coordinators with more than two years of occupational experience.

The coordination category "Developing Training Agreements" was ranked number one by both respondent groups and the coordination categories "Related on-the-job Instruction" and "Adult Distributive Education" were ranked eighth and ninth respectively by both respondent groups. The greatest disparity between rankings occurred in the "Developing Training Plans" and "Student Control" categories. A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .48 was computed as a measure of the similarity between the coordination category rankings of the two respondent groups.

Those teacher-coordinators with two years or less of occupational experience rated eight of the nine major categories of coordination activities as being of considerable importance and the category "Adult Distributive Education" as being of little importance. Those teacher-coordinators with over two years of occupational experience rated five of the nine major categories of coordination activities as being of considerable importance with the remaining four categories rated as being very important.

The t-test to determine the difference between respondent group composite opinion mean scores indicated that distributive education teacher coordinators in Mississippi differed significantly (beyond the .01 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon the number of years of occupational experience (two years or less vs. more than two years). Refer to Table 5 for a complete examination of coordination category mean scores, standard deviations, Spearman Rho
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Category</th>
<th>N=36 Two Years or Less</th>
<th>N=12 More Than Two Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Students</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related On-The-Job Instruction</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Control</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Distributive Education</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of On-The-Job Training</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Agreements</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Plans</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Training Stations</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Opinion Mean Score</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rho: .48
T-test Results: Significant (p < .01)
rank-order correlation coefficient, and t-test results.

Research Question Number Four

Does a relationship exist between the type of undergraduate degree held by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities? Composite opinion mean scores were computed for the following categories: (1) undergraduate degree in distributive education, (2) undergraduate degree in any one of the remaining vocational education service areas, (3) undergraduate degree in business, and (4) undergraduate degree in "other" areas. Composite opinion mean scores for the four groups of respondents according to the type of undergraduate degree held were computed as follows: (1) distributive education (3.06), (2) vocational education (3.12), (3) business (3.47), and (4) "other" (3.47).

The coordination category "Developing Training Agreements" was ranked number one by three of the four groups of respondents. The coordination category "Adult Distributive Education" was ranked ninth by three of the four respondent groups. The greatest disparity between the rankings of the categories of coordination activities by the four respondent groups occurred in the "Developing Training Plans" category. A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .62 was computed as a measure of the similarity between coordination category rankings between those who possessed undergraduate degrees in distributive education and those with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas. A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .28 was computed as a measure of the similarity between coordination
category rankings for those with undergraduate degrees in business and those with undergraduate degrees in distributive education. A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .45 was computed as a measure of the similarity between coordination category rankings for those with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category and for those with undergraduate degrees in distributive education. A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .15 was computed as a measure of the similarity between coordination category rankings for those with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas and for those with undergraduate degrees in business. A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .84 was computed as a measure of the similarity of rankings of coordination categories between those with undergraduate degrees in vocational education and those with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category. Finally, a Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .76 was computed as a measure of the similarity between coordination category rankings between those who possessed undergraduate degrees in business and those with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category.

Those with undergraduate degrees in distributive education and those with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas rated the nine major categories of coordination activities as being of considerable importance. Those with undergraduate degrees in business rated six of the nine major categories of coordination activities as being very important and the remaining three categories as being of considerable importance. Those with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category rated four of the nine major categories of
coordination activities as being very important and the remaining five categories as being of considerable importance.

The t-test to determine the difference between respondent group composite opinion mean scores indicated that:

1. Distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi differed significantly (beyond the .01 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon comparison of opinion mean scores between those with undergraduate degrees in distributive education and those with undergraduate degrees in business.

2. Distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi did not differ significantly (at the .05 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon comparison of opinion mean scores between those with undergraduate degrees in distributive education and those with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas.

3. Distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi differed significantly (beyond the .05 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon comparison of opinion mean scores for those with undergraduate degrees in distributive education and those with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category.

4. Distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi differed significantly (beyond the .05 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon comparison of opinion mean scores for those with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas and those with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category.
5. Distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi did not differ (at the .05 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon comparison of opinion mean scores between those with undergraduate degrees in business and the "other" category.

6. Distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi differed significantly (beyond the .01 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon comparison of opinion mean scores between those with undergraduate degrees in vocational education and those with undergraduate degrees in business.

Refer to Table 6 for a complete examination of coordination category mean scores, standard deviations, Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficients, and t-test results.

Research Question Number Five

Does a relationship exist between the type of graduate degree held by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities? Composite opinion mean scores were computed for the following categories: (1) those who possessed Master's degrees in vocational education with an emphasis in distributive education (indicated completion of at least twelve hours of graduate vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators), and (2) those who possessed Master's degrees in other areas and who reported completing no course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators. A composite opinion mean score of 3.08 was
### TABLE 6

**COORDINATION CATEGORY MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANKINGS ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE HELD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Category</th>
<th>Type of Undergraduate Degree N=11</th>
<th></th>
<th>Type of Undergraduate Degree N=25</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Students</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related On-The-Job Instruction</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Control</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Distributive Education</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of On-The-Job Training</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Agreements</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Plans</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Training Stations</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Opinion Mean Score</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rho: .62  
T-test Results: Did Not Differ Significantly (p > .05)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Students</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related On-The-Job Instruction</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Control</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Distributive Education</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of On-The-Job Training</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Agreements</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Plans</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Training Stations</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Opinion Mean Score</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rho:  
DE/Bus      .28  DE/Bus      Differed Significantly (p < .01)  
DE/Other    .45  DE/Other    Differed Significantly (p < .05)  
Other/Voc Ed .84 Other/Voc Ed Differed Significantly (p < .05)  
Voc Ed/Bus  .15  Voc Ed/Bus  Differed Significantly (p < .01)  
Bus/Other   .76  Bus/Other   Did Not Differ Significantly (p > .05)
computed for those who held Master's degrees with an emphasis in distributive education. A composite opinion mean score of 2.97 was computed for those who held Master's degrees in other areas and had completed no course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators.

Those respondents who held Master's degrees in other areas ranked the coordination category "Public Relations" number one with a mean score of 3.33. Those respondents with Master's degrees with an emphasis in distributive education ranked the coordination category "Developing Training Agreements" as number one with a mean score of 3.40. The greatest disparity between the rankings of coordination categories by the two respondent groups occurred in the "Student Control" and "Related on-the-job Instruction" categories. A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .35 was computed as a measure of the similarity between the rankings of the coordination categories by the two respondent groups.

Those with Master's degrees in vocational education with an emphasis in distributive education (12 hours of course work) rated the nine major categories of coordination activities as being of considerable importance. Those teacher-coordinators with Master's degrees in other areas who had taken no course work in distributive education also rated the nine major categories of coordination activities as being of considerable importance to the operation of cooperative distributive education programs.

The t-test to determine the difference between respondent group composite opinion mean scores indicated that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi differed significantly (beyond the
.05 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon the type of graduate degree held (emphasis in distributive education vs. emphasis in other areas). Refer to Table 7 for a complete examination of coordination category mean scores, standard deviations, Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient, and t-test results.

Research Question Number Six

Does a relationship exist between the number of completed hours of undergraduate vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators and opinion toward recommended coordination activities? At the undergraduate level, respondents were categorized according to the following Mississippi certification guidelines: (1) those who indicated completing at least nine semester hours of course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators and were considered certified, and (2) those who had completed less than nine hours of course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators. A composite opinion mean score of 3.08 was computed for those teacher-coordinators who indicated completing less than nine hours of undergraduate vocational education course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators. A composite opinion mean score of 2.97 was computed for those teacher-coordinators who indicated completing nine or more hours of undergraduate vocational education course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators.

Those teacher-coordinators who indicated completing less than nine hours of vocational education course work rated the nine major
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Category</th>
<th>N=11 Master's Degree (DE)</th>
<th></th>
<th>N=4 Master's Degree (Other)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Students</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related On-The-Job Instruction</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Control</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Distributive Education</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of On-The-Job Training</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Agreements</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Plans</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Training Stations</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Opinion Mean Score</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rho: .35  
T-test Results: Significant (p < .05)
categories of coordination activities as being of considerable importance. Those teacher-coordinators who indicated completing at least nine semester hours of course work also rated the nine major categories as being of considerable importance.

The coordination category "Developing Training Agreements" was ranked number one and the coordination category "Adult Distributive Education" was ranked ninth by both respondent groups. The greatest disparity between the rankings of coordination categories by the two respondent groups occurred in the "Developing Training Plans" category. A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .84 was computed as a measure of the similarity of rankings of coordination categories by the two respondent groups.

The t-test to determine the difference between respondent group composite opinion mean scores indicated that distributive education teacher-coordinators did not differ significantly (at the .05 level) in their opinion toward recommended coordination activities based upon the number of completed undergraduate semester hours of course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators. Refer to Table 8 for a complete examination of coordination category mean scores, standard deviations, Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient, and t-test results.

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The results of the opinions of Mississippi distributive education teacher-coordinators toward recommended coordination activities were presented in this chapter. Composite opinion mean scores, coordination
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Category</th>
<th>N=20</th>
<th></th>
<th>N=13</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nine Hours or More</td>
<td>Less Than Nine Hours</td>
<td>Nine Hours or More</td>
<td>Less Than Nine Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Students</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related On-The-Job Instruction</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Control</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Distributive Education</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of On-The-Job Training</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Agreements</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Training Plans</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Training Stations</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Opinion Mean Score</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman Rho: .84  
T-test Results: Did Not Differ Significantly (p > .05)
category mean scores, and standard deviations were reported for the total population. Additionally, composite opinion mean scores, coordination category mean scores, Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficients, and t-test results were reported for respondent groups according to selected demographic characteristics. However, caution should be used in interpreting the findings presented in this chapter due to the fact that a series of univariate tests were used and the n's in certain categories were small.

Based on the findings reported in this chapter, it was concluded that secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi have high opinions of the recommended coordination activities and the nine major categories of coordination activities utilized in this study.
Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is concerned with the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study. Specifically, the chapter contains five major sections: (1) summary of purpose, (2) summary of procedures, (3) summary of findings, (4) conclusions, and (5) recommendations.

SUMMARY OF PURPOSE

This study was undertaken to investigate the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities. The primary purpose of this study was to provide state supervisors of distributive education and the distributive teacher educator in Mississippi with data and information which could be used to: (1) plan and structure selected aspects of the pre-service distributive teacher education program, and (2) plan and structure in-service educational programs with respect to cooperative distributive education. A secondary purpose was to determine whether relationships existed between years of teaching experience, occupational experience, type of undergraduate degree held, type of graduate degree held, the number of completed hours of undergraduate vocational education course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators, and opinion toward recommended coordination activities.
Population

The population of this study consisted of the fifty-two Mississippi secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators listed in the directory of distributive education personnel. This represented the total population of cooperative teacher-coordinators. Ninety-three percent (N=48) of the potential respondents marked and returned the opinionnaire in useable form. Those who were employed as project-method distributive education teachers were excluded from this study.

Opinionnaire Development

An opinionnaire was developed through a review of the literature with emphasis placed on five studies: (1) Warmke (1960), (2) Weatherford (1972), (3) Cotrell (1972), (4) Harris (1971) and (5) Crawford (1975). The opinionnaire was submitted to a panel of experts and pilot-tested in Virginia. All appropriate recommendations, suggestions, and comments were incorporated into the final opinionnaire which was divided into two sections. Section one was concerned with the collection of demographic data from the respondents. The information that was sought pertained to:

1. Years of teaching experience
2. Years of occupational experience
3. Type of undergraduate degree held
4. Type of graduate degree held
5. Completed hours of undergraduate vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators.

Section two contained fifty statements which attempted to examine
the respondent's opinion toward each recommended coordination activity. The respondents were asked to indicate their opinions of recommended coordination activities by marking a four-point Likert scale. The four-point Likert scale represented degrees of importance ranging from very important to no importance.

Data Treatment and Statistical Analysis

A mean score of "3.50 - 4.00" for each recommended coordination activity or category of coordination activities indicated that the coordination activity or category was very important. This means that the coordination activity or category was considered to be the generally accepted practice in almost all circumstances. A mean score of "2.50 - 3.49" for each recommended coordination activity or category of coordination activities indicated that the coordination activity or category was of considerable importance. This means that the coordination activity or category was practiced in most circumstances. A mean score of "1.50 - 2.49" indicated that the coordination activity or category was of little importance. This means that the coordination activity or category was seldom appropriate.

The data were coded, transferred to optical scanner sheets, key punched, verified for processing, and processed using The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics (composite means and standard deviations) were computed for each recommended coordination activity and category of coordination activities for the total population and for each respondent group according to selected demographic characteristics. Recommended coordination activities and categories of coordination activities were then ranked accordingly for
the total population and for each respondent group. To compare respondent group rankings, the Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient was employed to determine the degree of similarity or dissimilarity of the rankings of coordination categories. In addition to observed differences, t-tests were employed to determine whether or not respondent group composite mean scores were significantly different.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study provided information about the opinions of Mississippi secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators toward recommended coordination activities. This information was intended to help state supervisors of distributive education and the distributive education teacher educator in Mississippi plan and structure selected aspects of both pre-service and in-service offerings in cooperative distributive education.

Summary of Research Question Number One

What are the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities? The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for the total population was 3.18. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by the total population were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Selecting Training Stations," and (3) "Selecting Students." The three coordination categories rated lowest in importance by the total population were: (7) "Developing Training Plans,"
(8) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education." The coordination activities rated highest in importance by the total population and considered as very important to the operation of cooperative distributive education programs were:

1. Prepare student-learner for interview with cooperating employer and training station personnel (3.60).

2. Assist students in the solution of problems related to on-the-job-training (3.56).

3. Encourage the employer to provide a wide variety of experiences associated with an occupation (3.54).

4. Match a student-learner's unique characteristics with an appropriate training station (3.52).

5. Develop a cooperative training agreement between student-learner, parents, school, and cooperating employer (3.52).


The remaining forty-four recommended coordination activities were rated by the total population as being of considerable importance. Refer to Tables 2 and 3 in Chapter 4 for further examination of this data.

Summary of Research Question Number Two

Does a relationship exist between the number of years of teaching experience of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities? The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for beginning teacher-coordinators was
3.33. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by beginning teacher-coordinators were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Selecting Training Stations," and (3) "Public Relations." The three coordination categories rated lowest in importance by beginning teacher-coordinators were: (7) "Student Control," (8) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for experienced teacher-coordinators was 3.11. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by experienced teacher-coordinators were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Selecting Students," and (3) "Student Control." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance by experienced teacher-coordinators were: (7) "Developing Training Plans," (8) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .68 was computed as a measure of the similarity between rankings of coordination categories by the two respondent groups. T-test results indicated that opinion mean scores differed significantly beyond the .05 level. Refer to Table 4 in Chapter 4 for further examination of this data.

**Summary of Research Question Number Three**

Does a relationship exist between the number of years of occupational experience of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination
activities? The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for teacher-coordinators with two years or less of occupational experience was 2.89. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by those with two years or less of occupational experience were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Student Control," and (3) "Selecting Students." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Developing Training Plans," (8) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for teacher-coordinators with more than two years of occupational experience was 3.45. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by teacher-coordinators with more than two years of occupational experience were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Selecting Training Stations," and (3) "Developing Training Plans." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Public Relations," (8) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .48 was computed as a measure of the similarity between rankings of coordination categories by the two respondent groups. T-test results indicated that opinion mean scores differed significantly beyond the .01 level. Refer to Table 5 in Chapter 4 for further examination of this data.
Summary of Research Question Number Four

Does a relationship exist between the type of undergraduate degree held by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities? The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in distributive education was 3.06. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in distributive education were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Public Relations," and (3) "Selecting Training Stations." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Related on-the-job Instruction," (8) "Developing Training Plans," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas was 3.12. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by this respondent group were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Student Control," and (3) "Selecting Training Stations." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Coordination of on-the-job Training," (8) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for teacher-coordinators with undergraduate
degrees in business was 3.47. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by this respondent group were: (2.5) "Developing Training Plans," (2.5) "Selecting Training Stations," (2.5) "Selecting Students," (2.5) "Public Relations" (four-way tie), (5) "Coordination of on-the-job Training," and (6) "Developing Training Agreements." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Student Control," (8) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category was 3.47. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by this respondent group were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Developing Training Plans," and (3) "Selecting Training Stations." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Public Relations," (8) "Adult Distributive Education," and (9) "Related on-the-job Instruction."

Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficients were computed to determine the degree of similarity of rankings of coordination categories between respondent groups and t-tests were employed to determine if significant differences existed between respondent group opinion mean scores. Refer to Table 6 in Chapter 4 for a complete examination of the data.

Summary of Research Question Number Five

Does a relationship exist between the type of graduate degree held by secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and opinion toward recommended coordination activities? The
composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for teacher-coordinators with Master's degrees with an emphasis in distributive education was 3.08. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by this respondent group were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Public Relations," and (3) "Student Control." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Coordination of on-the-job Training," (8) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for teacher-coordinators with Master's degrees in other areas and no completed course work in distributive education was 2.97. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by this respondent group were: (1) "Public Relations," (2) "Developing Training Agreements," and (3) "Related on-the-job Instruction." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Selecting Training Stations," (8) "Adult Distributive Education," and (9) "Student Control."

A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .35 was computed as a measure of the similarity between rankings of coordination categories between the two respondent groups. T-test results indicated that opinion mean scores differed significantly beyond the .05 level. Refer to Table 7 in Chapter 4 for further examination of this data.

Summary of Research Question Six

Does a relationship exist between the number of completed hours of undergraduate vocational education courses designed specifically to
train distributive education teacher-coordinators and opinion toward recommended coordination activities? The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for those teacher-coordinators who had completed less than nine hours of undergraduate vocational education course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators was 3.08. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by this respondent group were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Public Relations," and (3) "Selecting Training Stations." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Related on-the-job Instruction," (8) "Developing Training Plans," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

The composite opinion mean score for all coordination activities listed in the opinionnaire for those who had completed nine hours or more of undergraduate vocational education course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators was 2.97. Of the nine major categories, the three categories of coordination activities rated highest in importance by this respondent group were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Selecting Training Stations," and (3) "Public Relations." The three categories of coordination activities rated lowest in importance were: (7) "Student Control," (8) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (9) "Adult Distributive Education."

A Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficient of .84 was computed as a measure of the similarity of the rankings of coordination categories between the two respondent groups. T-test results indicated that opinion mean scores did not differ significantly at the .05 level. Refer to Table 8 in Chapter 4 for further examination of this data.
CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions have been made:

1. The total population of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi were asked to indicate their opinion toward fifty recommended coordination activities by marking a four-point Likert scale indicating their degree of agreement or disagreement. The following conclusions are based upon responses to those items within the survey opinionnaire:

   a. Since the respondents rated six (12 percent) of the fifty recommended coordination activities as very important and the remaining forty-four (88 percent) recommended coordination activities as being of considerable importance, it may be concluded that secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi have high opinions of the recommended coordination activities included in this study and that these coordination activities are necessary to the successful operation of cooperative distributive education programs in the state of Mississippi.

   b. Since there were nine major categories of coordination activities which the respondents rated as being of considerable importance, it may be concluded that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi have high opinions of the nine major categories of coordination activities included in this study and believe that these categories of coordination activities are necessary to the successful operation of cooperative distributive education programs in the state of Mississippi.
Mississippi.

2. The total population of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi were categorized according to predetermined demographic characteristics. Composite opinion mean scores and coordination category mean scores were computed for each respondent group. Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficients were computed to determine the degree of similarity of rankings of coordination categories. In addition to observed differences, t-tests were then employed as an additional measure to determine whether or not differences existed between composite opinion mean scores. The following conclusions are based upon the responses made by each respondent group:

a. Since a significant difference occurred (beyond the .05 level) between composite opinion mean scores of beginning distributive education teacher-coordinators (three years or less of experience) and experienced distributive education teacher-coordinators (four or more years of experience), it may be concluded that these two respondent groups differ in their opinions toward recommended coordination activities. It was observed that beginning distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi had a higher opinion of eight of the nine major categories of coordination activities.

b. Since a significant difference occurred (beyond the .01 level) between composite opinion mean scores of distributive education teacher-coordinators with two years or less of occupational experience and distributive education teacher-coordinators with more than two years of occupational experience, it may be concluded that these two respondent groups differ in their opinions toward recommended coordination
activities. It was observed that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi with more than two years of occupational experience had a higher opinion of each of the nine major categories of coordination activities.

c. Since a significant difference occurred (beyond the .01 level) between composite opinion mean scores of distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in distributive education and distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in business, it may be concluded that these two respondent groups differ in their opinions toward recommended coordination activities. It was observed that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi with undergraduate degrees in business had a higher opinion of each of the nine major categories of coordination activities.

d. Since a significant difference did not occur (at the .05 level) between composite opinion mean scores of distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in distributive education and distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas, it may be concluded that these two respondent groups held similar opinions of recommended coordination activities. It was observed that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas had a higher opinion of eight of the nine major categories of coordination activities.

e. Since a significant difference occurred (beyond the .05 level) between composite opinion mean scores of distributive education
teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in distributive education and distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category, it may be concluded that these two respondent groups differ in their opinions toward recommended coordination activities. It was observed that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category had a higher opinion of each of the nine major categories of coordination activities.

f. Since a significant difference occurred (beyond the .05 level) between composite opinion mean scores of distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas and distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category, it may be concluded that these two respondent groups differ in their opinions toward recommended coordination activities. It was observed that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category had a higher opinion of each of the nine major categories of coordination activities.

g. Since a significant difference did not occur (at the .05 level) between composite opinion mean scores of distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in business and distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in the "other" category, it may be concluded that these two respondent groups held similar opinions of recommended coordination activities. It was observed that identical coordination category mean scores were computed for each respondent group for two of the nine major categories of coordination activities, and distributive education teacher-coordinators in
Mississippi with undergraduate degrees in business had higher opinions of five of the nine major categories of coordination activities.

h. Since a significant difference occurred (beyond the .01 level) between composite opinion mean scores of distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in business and distributive education teacher-coordinators with undergraduate degrees in one of the remaining vocational education service areas, it may be concluded that these two respondent groups differ in their opinions toward recommended coordination activities. It was observed that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi with undergraduate degrees in business had higher opinions of each of the nine major categories of coordination activities.

i. Since a significant difference occurred (beyond the .05 level) between composite opinion mean scores of distributive education teacher-coordinators with Master's degrees in distributive education and distributive education teacher-coordinators with Master's degrees in other areas, it may be concluded that these two respondent groups differ in their opinions toward recommended coordination activities. It was observed that distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi with Master's degrees in distributive education had higher opinions of seven of the nine major categories of coordination activities.

j. Since a significant difference did not occur (at the .05 level) between composite opinion mean scores of distributive education teacher-coordinators who had completed nine or more hours of undergraduate vocational education course work designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators and distributive education teacher-coordinators who had completed less than nine hours of undergraduate
vocational education course work designed specifically to train distribu-
tive education teacher-coordinators, it may be concluded that these two
respondent groups held similar opinions of recommended coordination activ-
ities. It was observed that distributive education teacher-coordinators
in Mississippi who had completed less than nine hours of course work de-
signed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators
had higher opinions of eight of the nine major categories of coordination
activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From an analysis of the findings and conclusions of this study,
certain recommendations are offered: These recommendations pertain to:
(1) recommendations resulting from the study, and (2) recommendations for
further research.

Recommendations Resulting from the Study

1. The following recommendations are made based upon the findings
and conclusions of this study:

   a. It is recommended that the findings of this study be pre-
   sented and discussed at professional meetings by distributive education
   state supervisors and the distributive education teacher educator in
   Mississippi.

   b. It is recommended that special emphasis be placed upon the
importance and value of the "Adult Distributive Education" category of
   coordination activities in both pre-service and in-service offerings in
   Mississippi. This recommendation is based upon the finding that this cat-
egory of coordination activities was rated lowest in importance by
the total population and by ten of the twelve respondent groups.

c. It is recommended that preference be given to those recommended coordination activities within each category of coordination activities that was rated lowest in importance by the total population of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi and most often by each respondent group when considering both pre-service and in-service offerings. Those categories of coordination activities were: (1) "Public Relations," (2) "Coordination of on-the-job Training," (3) "Developing Training Plans," (4) "Related on-the-job Instruction," and (5) "Adult Distributive Education."

d. It is recommended that the recommended coordination activities and categories of coordination activities utilized in this study be reviewed for possible use in distributive education pre-service instructional activities in Mississippi. This recommendation is based upon the finding that the total population of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi rated the recommended coordination activities as either very important or of considerable importance. In addition, the nine major categories of coordination activities utilized in this study were rated by the total population as being of considerable importance.

e. It is recommended that the nine major categories of coordination activities and the fifty recommended coordination activities utilized in this study be considered for use in the identification of evaluative criteria for the coordination phase of program operation for secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in the state of Mississippi. This recommendation is based upon the findings
that six recommended coordination activities were considered by the total population to be very important and the remaining forty-five recommended coordination activities were rated as being of considerable importance. In addition, the nine major categories of coordination activities were rated by the total population as being of considerable importance.

f. It is recommended that the recommended coordination activities utilized in this study be considered for use in developing formal procedures and guidelines for the coordination phase of program operation for secondary cooperative distributive education programs in the state of Mississippi.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations resulting from this study, the following recommendations for further research are offered:

1. A similar research study might be conducted in Mississippi to determine the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction resulting from the performance of the recommended coordination activities utilized in this study. The degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction might provide valuable information for planning and structuring both pre-service and in-service offerings.

2. The opinionnaire used in this study might be administered to graduates of the distributive teacher education program in Mississippi prior to beginning their first teaching assignment. The opinionnaire might then be administered to these same individuals upon completion of the first year of teaching. A comparison of opinionnaire responses could
provide insights relative to undergraduate curriculum and first-year teacher workshops.

3. A similar research study might be conducted in Mississippi to determine and/or compare the opinions of distributive education state supervisors, the distributive teacher educator, and school administrators toward recommended coordination activities.

4. A research study might be conducted in Mississippi and other states to determine the degree of perceived proficiency which exists in the performance of the various recommended coordination activities included in this study. Those recommended coordination activities in which the teacher-coordinator perceived the least proficiency could be identified as being important for in-service training.

5. A research study might be conducted in Mississippi and other states to determine what factors serve as barriers to the performance of the various recommended coordination activities utilized in this study.

6. A similar research study might be conducted in Mississippi to identify technical in-service needs.

7. A follow-up of the present study should be conducted in approximately five years to determine changes in opinion toward recommended coordination activities.
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SECONDARY DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHER-COORDINATORS
SECONDARY DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHER-COORDINATORS

R. H. Watkins High School  
P.O. Box 447  
Laurel, Mississippi  39440

North Panola High School  
Sardis, Mississippi  38666

West Point Area Vo-Tech Center  
P.O. Box 1136  
West Point, Mississippi  39773

Lanier High School  
833 West Maple Street  
Jackson, Mississippi  39203

Ross Collins Vocational Complex  
2640-24th Avenue  
Meridian, Mississippi  39301

Biloxi High School  
P.O. Box 168  
Biloxi, Mississippi  39530

South Panola High School  
Batesville, Mississippi  38606

Natchez-Adams Vocational Complex  
208 Lynda Lee Drive  
Natchez, Mississippi  39120

R. H. Watkins High School  
P.O. Box 447  
Laurel, Mississippi  39440

Greenville High School  
419 East Robert Shaw  
Greenville, Mississippi  38701

Ross Collins Vocational Complex  
2640-24th Avenue  
Meridian, Mississippi  39301

Winston-Louisville Vocational Complex  
204 Ivy Avenue  
Louisville, Mississippi  39339

Lee High School  
1815 Military Road  
Columbus, Mississippi  39701

Picayune Vocational Complex  
600 Goodyear Boulevard  
Picayune, Mississippi  39466

Bay Senior High School  
Blue Meadow Road  
Bay St. Louis, Mississippi  39520

Caldwell High School  
820 North Browder  
Columbus, Mississippi  39701

Greenville High School  
419 East Robert Shaw  
Greenville, Mississippi  38701

Newton High School  
Newton, Mississippi  39345
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational Complex</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Vocational Complex</td>
<td>715 Lakeview Drive</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>39056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Vocational Complex</td>
<td>Garrard Avenue</td>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>38930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picayune Vocational Complex</td>
<td>600 Goodyear Boulevard</td>
<td>Picayune</td>
<td>39466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontotoc Ridge Vocational Complex</td>
<td>100 Center Ridge Drive</td>
<td>Pontotoc</td>
<td>38863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nettleton High School</td>
<td>Nettleton</td>
<td>Nettleton</td>
<td>38858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Central Vocational Complex</td>
<td>Route 3, Box 150</td>
<td>Gulfport</td>
<td>39501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McComb Skill Center</td>
<td>McComb</td>
<td>McComb</td>
<td>39648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Albany Vocational Complex</td>
<td>P.O. Box 771</td>
<td>New Albany</td>
<td>38652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach High School</td>
<td>Garendale Avenue</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>39560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Panola High School</td>
<td>Batesville</td>
<td>Batesville</td>
<td>38606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Vocational Complex</td>
<td>P.O. Box 608</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>38851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County-Vicksburg Vocational Complex</td>
<td>Route 10, Box 385C</td>
<td>Vicksburg</td>
<td>39180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland High Vo-Tech Center</td>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>38732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Vocational Complex</td>
<td>715 Lakeview Drive</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>39056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulfport High School</td>
<td>2000-15th Street</td>
<td>Gulfport</td>
<td>39730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen Vocational Complex</td>
<td>1759 Rasco Road</td>
<td>Southaven</td>
<td>38671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada High School</td>
<td>Fairgrounds Road</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>38901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazoo City High School</td>
<td>516 East Canal Street</td>
<td>Yazoo City</td>
<td>39194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Point High School</td>
<td>Box 727</td>
<td>Moss Point</td>
<td>39563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford High School</td>
<td>Bramlett Boulevard</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>38655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coahoma Country High School  
Lee Drive  
Clarksdale, Mississippi 38614

Neshoba County High School  
Route 1  
Philadelphia, Mississippi 39350

Tupelo High School  
903 Fillmore Drive  
Tupelo, Mississippi 38801

Starkville Vocational Complex  
Yellow Jacket Drive  
Starkville, Mississippi 39759

Oxford High School  
Bramlett Boulevard  
Oxford, Mississippi 38655

Moss Point High School  
Box 727  
Moss Point, Mississippi 39563

Holly Springs Vocational Complex  
531 Walthall Street  
Holly Springs, Mississippi 38635

S. H. Blair High School  
301 Hutchison Avenue  
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401

Pascagoula Vocational Complex  
P.O. Box 250  
Pascagoula, Mississippi 39567

Provine High School  
2400 Robinson Street  
Jackson, Mississippi 39209

Southaven High School  
1759 Rasco Road  
Southaven, Mississippi 38671

West Jones High School  
Route 10  
Laurel, Mississippi 39440

Amory Vocational Complex  
P.O. Box 330  
Amory, Mississippi 38821
APPENDIX B

LETTERS OF APPROVAL FROM MISSISSIPPI
January 4, 1977

Distributive Education Program Area
310 Lane Hall
V.P.I. and State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dear :,

It was good to hear from you. We are pleased that you plan to do your dissertation in Mississippi. I believe your efforts to obtain data from Mississippi Cooperative Distributive Education teachers concerning "recommended coordination practices" will yield both valuable and useful information. Hopefully, we will be able to utilize the results of your study to initiate better planning and structuring of both pre-service and in-service training for Distributive Education teachers in our state.

Best of luck and please keep us posted on your progress.

Sincerely,

Assistant State Supervisor
Distributive Education

sc
January 5, 1977

Distributive Education Program Area
310 Lane Hall
V.P.I. and State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dear:

It is satisfactory with me for you to conduct a survey of the Distributive Education Cooperative teachers in Mississippi concerning "recommended coordination practices." I hope that the results of your survey will be meaningful for all concerned, and I know with your ability and enthusiasm for the project that it will be a success.

There is a tremendous need for consolidation of cooperative practices that will be used by all coordinators regardless of the service area.

If my office an offer assistance to you, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

State Supervisor
Distributive Education

SC
January 4, 1977

D.E. Program Area
310 Lane Hall
V.P.I. & State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dear

I was pleased to learn of your impending study of coordination practices in distributive education in Mississippi. As I understand it, you have analyzed the work of, and extracted information which relates to coordination practices and from this information you have constructed a questionnaire which will assess and make possible an analysis of coordination practices of Mississippi teacher-coordinators. The teacher-coordinators would then respond to a questionnaire to get an opinion of their own practices.

As you probably know, very little research has been done in vocational education in Mississippi. This is especially true in distributive education.

The study is needed and would be of value to our state staff in program planning. It would also be of great value to the distributive teacher education program here at Mississippi State University. In addition to using the information to plan our inservice program, it would be of value in revising and developing our pre-service program.

I feel that the study is definitely needed and would be a great contribution to our distributive education program in Mississippi. If I can be of any help, please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely,

Associate Professor
Distributive Education

JEP/mjs

Cooperating with the Division of Vocational and Technical Education, State Department of Education
APPENDIX C

COORDINATION PRINCIPLES
COORDINATION PRINCIPLES

A. Warmke (1960)

1. Coordination in school systems with more than one cooperative DE program should be done by the person who teaches the student.

2. The minimum number of hours a week that a student-learner should work is fifteen.

3. For their on-the-job experiences, cooperative part-time students should receive the prevailing wage for the type of work they are doing.

B. Weatherford (1972)

1. Coordination in school systems with more than one cooperative distributive education program should be done by the person who teaches the student.

2. Distributive education students should be paid for their on-the-job training on the basis of the same salary as paid to any part-time employee.

3. A written training plan is always necessary to insure optimum training.
APPENDIX D

COORDINATION ACTIVITIES
COORDINATION ACTIVITIES

1. A schedule developed by the coordinator and training sponsor for training each student.

2. Training session to prepare training sponsors for their role in training distributive education students.

3. Classroom instruction having a relationship to the learning experiences of a student in his training stations.

4. Training materials for the student to study in school, which are related to his training-station experiences.

5. A written training agreement that establishes the responsibilities of student, school, and employer.

6. Teacher-coordinators should place increased emphasis on the following three elements of the cooperative plan: training plans, advisory committees, and training sponsors.

7. Teacher-coordinators should devote proportionately more of their coordination time to the implementation of on-the-job training plans and to the solution of students' on-the-job problems.

8. Placement activities must include a review of the competencies and personal characteristics possessed by the students in relation to the particular expectations of employers.
APPENDIX E

COORDINATION TASKS
COORDINATION TASKS

1. Provide prospective student-learners with resource materials on occupational opportunities to aid them in selecting a vocation.
2. Establish criteria for selection of student-learner.
3. Gather student-learner selection data (e.g., test results, records, grades).
4. Administer occupational tests relative to student-learner selection and placement.
5. Interview students and parents to obtain student-learner interest and aptitude information.
6. Identify a prospective student-learner on basis of selection criteria and data.
7. Match a student-learner's unique characteristics with an appropriate training station.
8. Approve on-the-job training hours and wages for student-learner.
9. Establish criteria for evaluating training station potential of an employer.
10. Identify prospective cooperating employers to provide on-the-job training stations.
11. Assess educational adequacy of a prospective training station's facilities and equipment.
12. Arrange with a union to make contract provision for student-learner.
14. Assist cooperating employer in acquiring federal permit to pay a training wage.
15. Establish a cooperating employer's qualifications for reimbursement for training a student-learner.
16. Obtain reimbursement for cooperating employer providing on-the-job training.
17. Obtain reimbursement for student-learners for allowable training costs such as clothing and tools.
18. Develop a procedure to insure students' safety and protection in the training station.
19. Assess safety provisions of facilities and equipment of the prospective training station.
20. Assist cooperating employer in verifying the legality of employing a student-learner in a hazardous occupation.
21. Convince an employer to provide a training station for cooperative education.
22. Develop a cooperative training agreement between student-learner, parents, school, and cooperating employer.
23. Arrange school and work schedules with student-learners, faculty, and training station personnel.
24. Develop a plan for teacher-coordinator supervision of on-the-job training.
25. Develop systematic training plan with the on-the-job instructor.
26. Prepare student-learner for interview with cooperating employer and training station personnel.
27. Aid student-learner in procuring work permit.
29. Encourage on-the-job instructor to follow the progression of experiences for the student-learner outlined in the training plan.
30. Assess occupational experience daily reports with student-learners to plan future instruction.
31. Check student-learner progress with the on-the-job instructor and other training station personnel.
32. Maintain student-learner progress record forms for on-the-job training and related instruction.
33. Examine student-learner progress records to determine future on-the-job training experiences and related classroom assignments.
34. Assess student-learner's performance with assistance of the on-the-job instructor.
35. Obtain suggestions from on-the-job instructor to guide the selection of related class instruction lessons.
36. Assist students in the solution of problems related to on-the-job training.
37. Assist the cooperating employer's personnel in accepting the training status and role of the student-learners.
38. Inform administration of daily coordination itinerary.
39. Control student-learner absenteeism from related class and on-the-job training.
40. Control the transfer of student-learners within the cooperative program and to other school programs.
41. Conduct termination procedures for on-the-job training for a student-learner when conditions demand it and at the close of a training program.

42. Establish criteria to evaluate qualifications of prospective on-the-job instructors.

43. Assess training capability of the on-the-job instructors.

44. Assist on-the-job instructor with development of teaching techniques during visits to the training stations.

45. Obtain from advisory committee information on ways to improve related instruction and on-the-job training.

46. Expand related instruction for student-learners on the basis of information obtained from employers on new technology.

47. Provide teacher-training workshops to assist on-the-job instructor in techniques for teaching student-learners.
APPENDIX F

BASIC BELIEFS CONCERNING COORDINATION
BASIC BELIEFS CONCERNING COORDINATION

1. The primary purpose of coordination is to correlate classroom instruction with all sources of learning distributive occupational competencies, including on-the-job training, simulated experiences, and experiences provided through Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA).

2. Coordination in distributive education is primarily an instructional responsibility involving individual youths and adults. It also includes other activities of a community's distributive education program, such as public relations and certain aspects of guidance and research.

3. On-the-job training should include a planned sequence of activities and learning experiences and should be regarded with the same professional integrity by the teacher-coordinator as a class in school.

4. The amount of time which distributive education cooperative students spend on the job should be realistically appraised so that they will have time and energy to master the other subjects in which they are concurrently enrolled and to participate in social activities and family life.

5. Training sponsors of distributive education cooperative students should be oriented to their responsibilities in providing real-life learning experiences for students on the job. This includes periodic evaluation of the students' occupational experience.

6. Teacher-coordinators should be employed by the school system for a sufficient period of time before and after the regular school year so that they may effectively fulfill all of the responsibilities of the job.

7. Effective coordination activities provide an opportunity for the teacher-coordinator to acquire up-to-date occupational information.

8. Whenever possible, project plan students should have employment experiences (arranged and planned by the teacher-coordinator), which are coordinated and evaluated in terms of students' occupational objectives.

9. Each student should have an individualized training plan specifying competencies to be learned on-the-job and/or in the classroom laboratory. This plan should be cooperatively constructed by the teacher-coordinator, the training sponsor, and the student.
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COORDINATION CATEGORIES AND COORDINATION ACTIVITIES WITHIN EACH CATEGORY
COORDINATION CATEGORIES AND COORDINATION ACTIVITIES WITHIN EACH CATEGORY

Developing Training Plans

1. Develop a systematic training plan for each student-learner after conferences with the student-learner and training sponsor.

2. Record, in a training plan, the progress, knowledge, and skills mastered by each student-learner.

3. List the skills and related knowledge in a training plan to be mastered by the student-learner.

4. Define in the training plan, the student-learner's responsibility for personal conduct and performance in keeping with his/her career objective.

5. Periodically review the training plan with the employer and student-learner.

Selecting Training Stations

1. Match a student-learner's unique characteristics with an appropriate training station.

2. Establish criteria for evaluating training station personnel.

3. Develop a procedure to insure student safety and protection at the training station.

4. Select training stations for their educational value to the student-learner.

5. Establish criteria to evaluate qualifications of prospective on-the-job instructors.

6. Assess the training capability of the on-the-job instructors.

7. Conduct a community survey to identify potential training stations.

Student Control

1. Control the transfer of student-learners within the cooperative program and to other school programs.

3. Maintain a weekly wage and hour report for all cooperative students.

Adult Distributive Education

1. Determine adult instructional needs for employees in distributive occupations at various levels of responsibility.

2. Provide vocational guidance and counseling for adults who need training or retraining for a distributive occupation.

3. Provide information regarding adult education offerings available in the community.

4. Offer assistance to merchants who are encountering problems associated with their business.

5. Identify potential instructors for adult distributive education courses.

Student Selection

1. Gather student-learner selection data (i.e., standardized test results, attendance records, grades).

2. Interview parents prior to student-learner selection.

3. Interview students to determine student-learner interest and aptitude for a career in marketing and distribution.

4. Establish criteria for selection of student-learners.

5. Provide prospective student-learners with career orientation materials to aid them in selecting a vocation.

6. Administer occupational inventories to assist the student-learner in the determination of potential career interests.

Public Relations

1. Prepare and issue news releases which describe various program activities.

2. Maintain membership in a community civic or service organization.
3. Construct displays in the business community which promote the goals and purposes of distributive education.

4. Provide formal and informal recognition to employers and on-the-job instructors.

Related On-the-Job Instruction

1. Assess student-learner progress on the job to determine appropriate training experiences and related classroom assignments.

2. Develop related instruction for student-learners on the basis of information obtained from employers.

3. Obtain suggestions from on-the-job instructor to guide the development of related class instruction.

4. Prepare student-learner for interview with cooperating employer and training station personnel.

5. Assist student-learner in on-the-job training orientation.

Coordination of On-the-Job Training

1. Assess the student-learner's on-the-job performance with assistance of the on-the-job instructor.

2. Assist students in the solution of problems related to on-the-job training.

3. Encourage the employer to provide a wide variety of experiences associated with an occupation.

4. Visit each employer every two or three weeks to discuss the performance and progress of each student-learner.

5. Assist the on-the-job instructor with development of training procedures appropriate for cooperative students.

6. Provide workshops to assist the on-the-job instructor (training sponsor) with techniques for training student-learners.

7. Aid the student-learner in procuring a work permit.

8. Contact the on-the-job instructor and make an appointment prior to the coordination visit.

9. Allow for at least thirty minutes of coordination time per week per student (i.e., for twenty (20) students, you should spend
approximately ten (10) hours per week coordinating).

10. Inform the local school administration of daily coordination itinerary.

11. Assist the cooperating employer's personnel in accepting the training status and role of the student-learner.

Developing Training Agreements

1. Develop a cooperative training agreement between student-learner, parents, school, and cooperating employer.

2. Arrange school and work schedules with student-learners, school administrators, and training station personnel.

3. Approve on-the-job training hours and wages for the student-learner.

4. Assist an employer in verifying the legality of employing a student-learner in a hazardous occupation.
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APPENDIX I

COVER LETTER TO PANEL OF EXPERTS
Dear

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a member of the panel of experts and for your help in completing my doctoral dissertation in the distributive education program area at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. As a member of the panel, you are requested to review the enclosed opinionnaire with respect to clarity and the discreteness and accuracy of each item within the opinionnaire. Additional comments with respect to structure and content validity are also solicited.

The opinionnaire is to be utilized in conducting research in the state of Mississippi. It contains statements representing coordination activities and will be used to assess and analyze the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward these activities. A major purpose of this study is to acquire information which can be used to plan and structure in-service programs for secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi.

The coordination activities were identified and extracted from the following studies: (1) Warmke (1968); (2) Harris (1971); (3) Weatherford (1972); (4) Cotrell (1972); and (5) Crawford (1975).

Your review of the opinionnaire and subsequent recommendations and comments are important to the completion of this research. If possible, please return the opinionnaire and your comments and suggestions in the self-addressed envelope no later than March 25, 1977. Thank you for your assistance in this study.

Sincerely,

, Committee Chairman

RJB/dm

Enclosures
APPENDIX J

PANEL OF EXPERTS EVALUATION
OPINIONNAIRE EVALUATION

I. CLARITY

A. Are the directions clearly written? ___yes ___no

B. Are the opinionnaire statements written in clear and concise
terminology? ___yes ___no

Comments on Clarity:

II. OPINIONNAIRE STATEMENTS

A. Are the statements discrete, (separate and distinct)?
   ___yes ___no

B. Are the statements accurate in their description of coordina-
tion activities? ___yes ___no

Comments on Opinionnaire Statements:
III. CONTENT VALIDITY

A. Do the opinionnaire statements adequately reflect the coordination activities of the distributive education teacher-coordinator? ___yes ___no

B. Are there additional coordination activities that should be included in the opinionnaire? ___yes ___no

Comments on Content Validity:

IV. OPINIONNAIRE STRUCTURE

A. Is the opinionnaire design and format adequate?

___yes ___no

Comments on Structure:

V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS:
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PILOT-TEST MEMBERS

Mr. Richard G. Ellenberger
Goochland High School
Star Route, Box 11A
Goochland, Virginia 23063

Mr. Michael Foley
Fauquier High School
705 Waterloo Street
Warrenton, Virginia 22186

Mrs. Martha H. Hamre
Laurel Park High School
Route 8, Box 165
Martinsville, Virginia 24112

Ms. Irene Hatcher
Heritage High School
Chinook Place
Lynchburg, Virginia 24504

Mr. Woodrow D. McCain
Martinsville Senior High School
Commonwealth Boulevard
Martinsville, Virginia 24112
APPENDIX L

COVER LETTER TO PILOT-TEST MEMBERS
Thank you for agreeing to review my opinionnaire and for your help with the field test. As a person who is daily involved in the operation of a distributive education program, you are requested to review and respond to the opinionnaire and complete the enclosed evaluation form.

The opinionnaire is to be utilized in conducting research in the state of Mississippi. It contains statements representing coordination activities and will be used to assess and analyze the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward these activities. A major purpose of this study is to acquire information which can be used to plan and structure in-service programs for secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi.

The coordination activities were identified and extracted from the following studies: (1) Warmke (1960); (2) Harris (1971); (3) Weatherford (1972); (4) Cotrell (1972); and (5) Crawford (1975).

Your review of the opinionnaire and subsequent recommendations and comments are important to the completion of this research. If possible, please return the opinionnaire and your comments and suggestions in the self-addressed envelope no later than April 3, 1977. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Instructor Committee Chairman

RJB/dm

Enclosures
APPENDIX M

FINAL OPINIONNAIRE
OPINION SURVEY
FOR
MISSISSIPPI DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHER-COORDINATORS

SECTION I

Directions: Please answer the following questions by filling in the blank spaces provided. This information will be considered confidential and will be used only for classification purposes.

1. Total number of years experience as a secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinator:
   Please specify

2. Total number of years of occupational experience in a distributive occupation:
   ______________________ full-time ______________________ part-time

3. Type of undergraduate degree held and major field of study:
   Please specify

4. Type of graduate degree held and area of concentration (if applicable):
   Please specify

5. Number of completed hours of vocational education courses designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators:
   ______________________ undergraduate ______________________ graduate
SECTION II

Directions: Please evaluate each statement and circle the appropriate rating which most nearly expresses your opinion of the coordination activity. Remember that there is no right or wrong response.

Descriptors for Rating Scale:

Agree: This is a coordination activity which, in my opinion, is very important to the operation of the cooperative distributive education program (i.e., this should be the generally accepted practice in almost all circumstances related to this coordination activity).

Tend to Agree: This is a coordination activity which, in my opinion, is of considerable importance to the operation of the cooperative distributive education program (i.e., this should be the practice in most circumstances related to this coordination activity).

Tend to Disagree: This is a coordination activity which, in my opinion, is of little importance to the operation of the cooperative distributive education program (i.e., this coordination activity is seldom appropriate).

Disagree: This is a coordination activity which, in my opinion, is of no importance to the operation of the cooperative distributive education program (i.e., this coordination activity is, under no circumstances, applicable).

In my opinion, it is important for the distributive education teacher-coordinator to:

A TA TD D 1. Gather student-learner selection data (i.e., standardized test results, attendance records, grades).
A TA TD D 2. Prepare and issue news releases which describe various program activities.
A TA TD D 3. Match a student-learner's unique characteristics with an appropriate training station.
A TA TD D 4. Allow for at least thirty minutes of coordination time per week per student (i.e., for twenty (20) students, you should spend approximately ten (10) hours per week coordinating).
A TA TD D 5. Maintain membership in a community civic or service organization.
A TA TD D 6. Provide workshops to assist the on-the-job instructor (training sponsor) with techniques for training student-learners.
A TA TD D 7. Interview parents prior to student-learner selection.
A TA TD D 8. Develop a systematic training plan for each student-learner after conferences with the student-learner and training sponsor.
9. Determine adult instructional needs for employees in distributive occupations at various levels of responsibility.

10. Arrange school and work schedules with student-learners, school administrators, and training station personnel.

11. Construct displays in the business community which promote the goals and purposes of distributive education.

12. Record, in a training plan, the progress, knowledge, and skills mastered by each student-learner.

13. Inform the local school administration of daily coordination itinerary.

14. Establish criteria to evaluate qualifications of prospective on-the-job instructors.

15. Assess student-learner progress on the job to determine appropriate training experiences and related classroom assignments.

16. Conduct a community survey to identify potential training stations.

17. Approve on-the-job training hours and wages for the student-learner.

18. Establish criteria for evaluating training station potential.

19. Assist the cooperating employer's personnel in accepting the training status and role of the student-learner.

20. Provide formal and informal recognition to employers and on-the-job instructors.

21. Develop related instruction for student-learners on the basis of information obtained from employers.

22. Administer occupational inventories to assist the student-learner in the determination of potential career interests.

23. Obtain suggestions from on-the-job instructor to guide the development of related class instruction.

24. Provide vocational guidance and counseling for adults who need training or retraining for a distributive occupation.

25. Assess the training capability of the on-the-job instructors.

26. Visit each employer every two or three weeks to discuss the performance and progress of each student-learner.

27. List the skills and related knowledge in a training plan to be mastered by the student-learner.

28. Aid the student-learner in procuring a work permit.
A TA TD D 29. Develop a procedure to insure student safety and protection at the training station.

A TA TD D 30. Provide information regarding adult education offerings available in the community.

A TA TD D 31. Assess the student-learner's on-the-job performance with assistance of the on-the-job instructor.

A TA TD D 32. Control the transfer of student-learners within the cooperative program and to other school programs.

A TA TD D 33. Assist students in the solution of problems related to on-the-job training.

A TA TD D 34. Offer assistance to merchants who are encountering problems associated with their business.

A TA TD D 35. Assist an employer in verifying the legality of employing a student-learner in a hazardous occupation.

A TA TD D 36. Develop a cooperative training agreement between student-learner, parents, school, and cooperating employer.

A TA TD D 37. Maintain student-learner progress record forms for on-the-job training and related instruction.

A TA TD D 38. Maintain a weekly wage and hour report for all cooperative students.

A TA TD D 39. Define in the training plan, the student-learner's responsibility for personal conduct and performance in keeping with his/her career objective.

A TA TD D 40. Interview students to determine student-learner interest and aptitude for a career in marketing and distribution.

A TA TD D 41. Encourage the employer to provide a wide variety of experiences associated with an occupation.

A TA TD D 42. Assist the on-the-job instructor with development of training procedures appropriate for cooperative students.

A TA TD D 43. Periodically review the training plan with the employer and student-learner.

A TA TD D 44. Identify potential instructors for adult distributive education courses.

A TA TD D 45. Select training stations for their educational value to the student-learner.

A TA TD D 46. Assist student-learner in on-the-job training orientation.
A TA TD D 47. Establish criteria for selection of student-learners.

A TA TD D 48. Provide prospective student-learners with career orientation materials to aid them in selecting a vocation.

A TA TD D 49. Prepare student-learner for interview with cooperating employer and training station personnel.

A TA TD D 50. Contact the on-the-job instructor and make an appointment prior to the coordination visit.

THANK YOU!

PLEASE RETURN THIS COMPLETED FORM IN THE POSTAGE-PAID ENVELOPE TO:

Ronald J. Brownlee
310 Lane Hall
Distributive Education Program Area
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
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LETTER TO RESPONDENTS FROM THE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION
STATE SUPERVISOR IN MISSISSIPPI
April 7, 1977

TO: Selected Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators

FROM: State Supervisor, Distributive & Cooperative Education

SUBJECT: Study of Policies and Procedures for Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators in Mississippi by

In fulfilling his requirements for a doctoral dissertation, will be submitting to you a questionnaire. He currently is attending V.P.I. in Blacksburg, Virginia. Prior to that time, he was a coordinator of Distribution & Marketing Technology at Northeast Mississippi Junior College. I fully endorse his study and ask that you complete the questionnaire and return to him at your earliest convenience.

It is my hope that the information received will be of assistance to us as we work to improve our Cooperative Training Program in Mississippi.

Again, thanks for your cooperation.
APPENDIX O

COVER LETTER TO RESPONDENTS
I am currently a doctoral student at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in the Distributive Education Program Area. The purpose of this correspondence is to invite you to participate in a research effort involving secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators. The study has the support of both distributive education state supervisory and teacher education personnel in the state of Mississippi.

The enclosed opinionnaire contains statements representing coordination activities and will be used to assess and analyze the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators toward these activities. A major purpose of this study is to acquire information which can be used to plan and structure in-service programs for secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi.

The opinionnaires have been coded, but this has been done for the purpose of sending follow-up letters. Individual responses will be kept in strict confidence and the data will be reported collectively.

The future direction of distributive education in the state of Mississippi can be influenced by your response. Therefore, receipt of your individual response is most important. Please return the opinionnaires no later than April 18, 1977. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Instructor

Committee Chairman

RJB/dm

Enclosures
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ANALYSIS OF OPINIONS OF SECONDARY COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHER-COORDINATORS IN MISSISSIPPI TOWARD RECOMMENDED COORDINATION ACTIVITIES

by

Ronald James Brownlee

(ABSTRACT)

Purpose

This study was undertaken to investigate the opinions of secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in Mississippi toward recommended coordination activities. The primary purpose of this study was to provide state supervisors of distributive education and the distributive teacher educator in Mississippi with data and information which could be used to: (1) plan and structure selected aspects of the pre-service distributive teacher education program, and (2) plan and structure in-service educational programs with respect to cooperative distributive education. A second purpose was to determine whether relationships existed between years of teaching experience, occupational experience, type of undergraduate degree held, type of graduate degree held, and number of completed hours of undergraduate course work in vocational education designed specifically to train distributive education teacher-coordinators, and opinion toward recommended coordination activities.
Procedure

An opinionnaire was developed through a review of the literature with emphasis placed on five studies: (1) Warmke (1960), (2) Harris (1971), (3) Cotrell (1972), (4) Weatherford (1972), and (5) Crawford (1975). The opinionnaire incorporated a 1 - 4 point Likert-type scale for respondents to indicate their opinion toward recommended coordination activities. In analyzing the data, descriptive statistics (composite means and standard deviations), Spearman Rho rank-order correlation coefficients, and t-tests were used to compare the responses of the total population and categorized respondent groups.

Population

This study was concerned with selected demographic characteristics and opinions of a single population--secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators in the state of Mississippi employed during the 1976-77 school year. The total population of fifty-two secondary cooperative distributive education teacher-coordinators was included in this study.

Summary of Findings

The categories of coordination activities most often rated highest in importance by the respondent groups were: (1) "Developing Training Agreements," (2) "Selecting Training Stations," (3) "Public Relations," and (4) "Student Control." The categories of coordination activities most often rated lowest in importance were: (1) "Related on-the-job Instruction," (2) "Developing Training Plans," and (3) "Adult Distributive Education." The top rated coordination activity listed in the
opinionnaire for the total population was "Prepare the student-learner for an interview with cooperating employer and training station personnel."
The lowest rated coordination activity listed in the opinionnaire for the total population was "Provide vocational guidance and counseling for adults who need training or retraining for a distributive occupation."

**Major Recommendation**

Mississippi distributive education personnel, when considering both pre-service and in-service offerings in cooperative distributive education should review the findings of this study as presented in Chapter IV. The composite opinion mean scores and coordination category mean scores are reported for the fifty coordination activities and nine major categories of coordination activities for the total population and for categorized respondent groups. Specific recommendations with regard to the findings and conclusions are offered in Chapter V of the study.