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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND RELATED RESEARCH

The Problem

Work-study or cooperative education programs have been prevalent for over fifty years (Evans, 1969). Various names have been used to describe these programs such as "Cooperative Occupational Education" (Mason and Haines, 1965) and "Cooperative Work Education" (Evans, 1969). Basically, these programs consist of a teacher-coordinator supervising a student program of on-the-job training and school work.

Beginning in Boston in 1905, the first store training in schools was organized by Lucinda Prince. Gradually other states started cooperative programs of training for distribution. These training methods were relatively inadequate until the 1931 interpretation of the Smith-Hughes Act by the Federal Board for Vocational Education which allowed the use of industrial education funds for training in distributive and office occupations.

In 1931, the diversified occupations program was formally organized by Rakestraw (1947) and vocational leaders from twelve southern states and Puerto Rico. This vocational group developed guiding principles, essential factors, educational philosophy and a plan of operation for a cooperative occupations program. The state
supervisors of trade and industrial education in the southern region gave approval, developed minimum standards for operation and instituted the program.

Rapid progress in cooperative education followed with the enactment of the George-Deen Act in 1936, and the subsequent passage of the George-Barden Act in 1946 (Mason and Haines, 1965). Cooperative education gained considerable national recognition and support with the enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. In addition, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, which was established to evaluate the 1963 Act, strongly recommended additional support for cooperative programs. This support was based on research studies which showed cooperative education to have a better than eighty percent average in placing students in the jobs for which they were trained (Evans, 1969). As a result of these recommendations, Congress, through the 1968 Amendments, authorized $35 million of financial assistance for cooperative vocational education programs to states for the 1970 fiscal year. This assistance was for personnel, related instruction, and employers in cooperative education (Minear, 1969).

If a large amount of this cooperative education money could be used for preservice and inservice education of teacher-coordinators, Evans (1969) believed that a present shortage of qualified teacher-coordinators could be overcome. Evans further stated that well-prepared and able coordinators were commonly believed to be essential in successful programs. The qualities he listed for a successful coordinator were
the ability to plan in advance, an outgoing personality and the ability to organize and initiate ideas.

Some of the problems which arise in training coordinators were discussed by Cotrell (1969) at the Cooperative Vocational Education Institute at The City University of New York. One of the specific problems that he pointed out, was helping prospective coordinators develop competence in conducting initial conferences with employers. Since the first conference with a potential training station employer is very crucial, the problem of devising an effective method for training prospective coordinators to utilize conference skills is equally crucial.

One solution to this problem suggested by Cotrell (1969) was the possibility of a microteaching type addition to the preservice training provided for coordinators. Such training would include practice in the skills of conducting conferences with employers. Short (micro) practice conferences with employers and feedback from video recordings and master coordinators could also be included in this technique referred to by Cotrell as micro-coordination.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to develop and test a self-instructional package for helping preservice coordinators develop selected coordination skills.
Specific Objectives

The specific objectives for this project were as follows:

1. To develop a self-instructional package by which prospective coordinators may acquire cooperative education coordination skills.

2. To determine the effect of a self-instructional package on prospective coordinators' performance in the three coordination skills of:
   a. Establishing rapport with an employer in an initial conference.
   b. Explaining the cooperative program to an employer.
   c. Convincing an employer to provide a training station.

3. To determine the prospective coordinators' opinions of the value of the self-instructional package and their suggestions on how to improve it.

Review of Related Research

For assistance in developing a self-instructional package for training prospective coordinators, literature was reviewed in the following areas: microteaching and video recording, self-instruction, modeling and simulation. The following sections describe the applicable sources which were relevant to this study.

Microteaching and Video Recording

References to microteaching and video recording were found in the literature predominantly in relation to teaching. According to
Allen and Ryan (1969), microteaching was a scaled-down teaching encounter in class size and class time in which a planning, teaching, reviewing cycle was used in the development of single pedagogical skills. After two years of research and experience in the usage of microteaching at Stanford University, Allen and Fortune (1965) stated the following conclusions:

1. Microteaching is a valid and effective means of preinternship training.
2. Microteaching provides a convenient vehicle for the use of immediate student feedback and opportunity for intensive supervision in teacher training.
3. Microteaching provides realistic approximations to classroom teaching conditions allowing predictions of subsequent classroom teaching performance to be made with a high degree of accuracy.
4. Microteaching is accepted and regarded as a valuable experience by interns during the training process and after teaching experience.
5. Training variables can be identified and manipulated in microteaching [p. 10].

One of the characteristics of microteaching mentioned in the literature was the teach-reteach cycle. Stanford University (Allen, McDonald and Orme, 1966) developed a six-step cycle which consisted of plan, teach, critique, replan, reteach, and recritique. While video recording may or may not be included in microteaching, Meier (1968) included video recording in a five-step cycle of record, review, respond, refine, and reteach. Cotrell and Doty (1970a-c), Doty and Cotrell (1970a-b), Hoerner (1969), Chase, Doty and Cotrell (1970), Harrington, Doty and Cotrell (1970), and Cameron (1969) also used video recording and adopted the Stanford six-step cycle.
Proximity to reality was another characteristic of microteaching which was found in the literature. Allen and Ryan (1969) called it real teaching. The teacher was placed in a setting very similar to a real teaching situation. The major difference was that microteaching was for training and improvement and the teacher was free from concern about irrevocable mistakes. Another asset of microteaching was the possibility it allowed for working on one pedagogical skill at a time.

Concentration on specific skills was advocated by Meier (1968) and Allen (1969) on a one-at-a-time basis. Cotrell and Doty (1970a-c), Doty and Cotrell (1970b), Chase et al. (1970), Harrington et al. (1970), Hoerner (1969) and Cameron (1969) also used single pedagogical skills.

The advantages of these various techniques of microteaching were still being tested in several of the studies reviewed. However, many of the completed studies attested to the usefulness of microteaching. Cotrell and Doty (1970a-c) conducted studies using microteaching and video recording in vocational teacher education. The studies involving simulated teacher education were completed in laboratory settings and resulted in recommendations that selected microteaching and video recording feedback techniques be considered for field trial in vocational teacher education. Hoerner (1969) reported that preservice Trade and Industrial Teacher Education Workshop participants indicated that the video playbacks of their microteaching were beneficial, valuable and not overly traumatic. These same participants indicated a desire for inservice self-improvement video recording opportunities. Harrington et al. (1970) reported that in an inservice study at the Columbus Technical Institute, Columbus, Ohio, the faculty participants
indicated two-to-one in an opinionnaire that video tape playbacks were useful in analyzing their microteaching sessions and that they would use video recording equipment if it were available. In a study which was conducted in three areas of New York state, Doty and Cotrell (1970b) concluded that video replay was preferred, but not essential, due to the effectiveness of the microteaching cycle. In a study of remote supervision techniques of student teachers conducted in cooperation with The Ohio State University, School of Home Economics, Smith (1969) reported no significant differences occurred among three treatment groups on supervisor's satisfaction and performance. Smith, therefore, indicated that the use of media resources (which included video recording) made possible alternative methods of college supervision. Cameron (1969), reporting a study in cooperation with Colorado State University, indicated an inservice program could be conducted by using remote supervision techniques which relied on microteaching and video recording. He found that no significant differences existed in performance or expressed level of satisfaction among remote feedback groups, and that all three treatment groups significantly improved (p < .01) their performance scores from pretest to posttest on the composite of three teaching skills. Cameron concluded that the remote inservice program was feasible and helped beginning teachers improve their teaching performance.

In two studies completed at the University of Illinois in higher education, Perlberg (1968a-b) concluded that a systematic method for analysis of video tapes and for the acquisition of new teaching skills was provided by microteaching techniques. These
conclusions were based on general impressions of the researchers, however, rather than on a systematic quantitative analysis. In an inservice study with twenty-one student teachers in the Department of Vocational and Technical Education at the University of Illinois, which used microteaching and video recording, Perlberg (1968a) concluded that most participants considered the project activities a valuable experience.

Young (1967) used the microteaching format in his study on self-instruction, modeling and video recording. Although his study did not directly test microteaching, he recommended that preservice teachers use the microteaching format for role-playing various behaviors. From his experiences at Stanford University and the University of Maryland and his wife's experiences at The John Hopkins University, Young (1968) summarized the advantages of microteaching as follows:

As an instrument which focuses on specific teaching skills, microteaching has many advantages. Microteaching provides both the experienced and novice teacher the opportunity to analyze and modify teaching behavior with or without the assistance of a colleague or supervisor. For the experienced teacher, it offers the opportunity to acquire and practice new teaching skills and to refine existing ones. For the novice participating in this approach, it can eliminate much of the trauma, discouragement, and failure often accompanying a sudden immersion into the complexities of teaching [p. 189].

At the Far West Laboratory, Borg (1969) developed a minicourse model which was based on Stanford University's microteaching model. Tests showed that the minicourse produced significantly large changes (p < .001) in nine of twelve teaching behaviors. The video recorder
was an integral part of the program and was instrumental in supplying feedback for self-evaluation.

From a study conducted in business and industry, Stroh (1969) reported that video tape training was advantageous for the trainee because, "He performs; he views himself on television; he participates in the evaluation of his performance—he is actively involved in the learning process [p. 20]."

Although Allen and Ryan (1969) listed many advantages of microteaching, they pointed out that as yet the potential and limitations were unknown. However, Allen and Ryan strongly advocated the unique setting which microteaching and video recording provided for training and research in teaching.

Self-Instruction

Self-instruction refers to a setting in which the subject accomplishes a goal without outside assistance. An example is an individual learning a skill without supervisory or peer assistance.

Under the direction of Borg (1969), the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development designed a teacher training technique known as the minicourse instructional model. This minicourse, which was a self-contained instructional package, was based on the process of microteaching and the use of video tape recording. The package contained instructional films, handbooks and evaluation forms. The planning stage of each minicourse consisted of stating the specific objectives or behavioral changes to be achieved and planning a tentative course sequence.
In the first minicourse of the Far West Laboratory, twelve specific teacher behaviors relating to conducting a class discussion in the elementary school were designated to produce change in teacher behavior. As previously noted (p. 8), it was shown that the teachers using the minicourse made significant gains ($p < .001$) on nine of the twelve behavior scores. And, the results of a posttest four months after the study indicated very high retention of the skills involved.

So far, the research evidence has indicated that the minicourse instructional model worked; but, Borg stated that a great deal of research was needed to learn why it worked and how it could be improved. Borg did not report how the minicourse model compared to other methods of teacher education.

Allen et al (1966) conducted a study on teaching skills in which three treatment groups were compared on feedback and reinforcement. Group one (the control group) received only written instructions and evaluated their own video tape feedback. Group two received written instructions which included behavior examples and suggestions. Group three received, in addition to written instructions, reinforcement from the experimenter while viewing the feedback. Group four received written instructions and reinforcement from the experimenter while viewing the tapes, plus discrimination training in which the experimenter pointed out salient cues. Group four was the most effective treatment. In a comparison of within-group treatment means, group four showed significance differences well beyond the .05 level. There were no significant within-group shifts in reinforcement in the first
group, and it was concluded that this treatment was least effective. The investigators felt that the total lack of cues or direction for group one caused the ineffectiveness since the trainees did not know when to emit the desired response. From the results of the experiment, it was concluded that self-feedback alone was not necessarily effective in producing behavior changes. The investigators believed that improvement in this self-feedback could be made by introducing some form of cueing procedure or by combining the techniques of model viewing and self-feedback.

In a study by Jensen (1968) on self-evaluation and inservice education, seventy teachers indicated in their written evaluations that self-observation produced a readiness to change their teaching behavior. Jensen gave the following reasons for success:

The project treatment of viewing oneself and acting out one's vocational role precipitated both feelings of self-confidence in their vocational competencies and a readiness to engage in a rigorous, sophisticated analysis, evaluation and improvement in their teaching behavior repertoire [p. 25].

Jensen recommended that school districts make video recording systems available to teachers for self-observation and self-evaluation purposes.

One distinct advantage of a self-instructional package is its potential for individualizing instruction. The self-instruction can be designed to allow each learner to proceed at his own rate. Postlethwait (1964) designed such an independent study program for a botany course at Purdue University. This audio-tutorial system was based on research studies which showed that the rate of learning new material depended on a student's past experience and learning techniques. In this system, the student was free to study at his own speed and convenience with
certain broad restrictions. For example, the student could play a film over as many times as desirable in order to master the subject matter. Also, the projector could be stopped or reversed at any point.

No comparative testing program was used to indicate the advantages of the audio-tutorial system over the conventional method of teaching botany, but based on personal judgment and grade distributions of students, Postlethwait believed that the audio-tutorial system was superior because student achievement was higher and student attitudes were improved. Also, at least one-third more information was covered, vandalism was reduced, more sophisticated experiments were available and retention was greater. The percentage of F grades decreased and there was a direct correlation between grade level and time spent in independent study sessions.

In a preliminary study of information acquisition rates for botany students, the group was divided into three sections according to high, middle and low analytic ability. Working only nine hours in a five-week period, students in the high analytic group exceeded the mean scores of students in the middle and low groups who worked twenty hours a week.

From a survey conducted in the Higher Educational Media Study, Thorton (1968) found that during the last ten years over fifty colleges and universities had adopted self-instructional (audio-tutorial) techniques. The survey indicated that the instructors, administrators and students were pleased with the effectiveness of learning techniques. The qualities and advantages of the methods
for students were listed as: active participation, choice of learning pace, freedom of repetition to gain mastery, and opportunity for review and evaluation.

Modeling

Bandura (1964) used real life and film models of aggressive behavior to study children's imitative responses. The film models proved to be as effective as the real life models. Children exposed to the aggressive models displayed many more imitative and original aggressive responses than children exposed to nonaggressive models. Other studies reported by Bandura (1964) indicated that appropriate models could elicit socially approved behavior such as volunteering services, eating odd foods and pledging one's self to a course of action. Bandura summarized the research that has been done on the influence of models on behavior by stating,

Relevant research demonstrates that when a model is provided, patterns of behavior are typically acquired in large segments or in their entirety rather than through a slow, gradual process based on differential reinforcement [p. 106].

Building on Bandura's findings, Orme (1966) tested the use of two types of models, symbolic and perceptual. Orme defined symbolic modeling as the process by which a person transmitted desired behaviors to a learner by means of written or verbal instructions. Perceptual modeling was defined as a transmission of desired behaviors by means of a filmed model who portrayed the desired behavior.
Six different combinations of these modeling techniques were tested in the study. The six treatment groups were:

1. **Minimal Symbolic Modeling** - received written instructions and discrimination training but no verbal instructions.

2. **Maximal Symbolic Modeling** - received written instruction, verbal discrimination training and reinforcement.

3. **Minimal Perceptual Modeling** - received written materials and viewed a perceptual model alone, but no discrimination training or reinforcement.

4. **Strong Symbolic, Minimal Perceptual Modeling** - received both verbal discrimination training and reinforcement and viewed a perceptual model alone.

5. **Maximal Perceptual** - received verbal discrimination while viewing a model (discrimination training from the experimenter was based directly on salient modeling cues).

6. **Strong Symbolic and Maximal Perceptual Modeling** - received verbal discrimination training during playbacks of their own performance and during the viewing of the appropriate perceptual model.

The treatments which consisted of variations of perceptual modeling produced significantly greater gain (p < .025) in the dependent variable (probing) than the symbolic modeling treatments. The largest difference between the groups occurred between the maximal symbolic group (group 2) and the minimal perceptual group (group 3). Group three achieved significantly more than group two on clarification (p < .025), repetition (p < .05) and probing (p < .10). It should
be noted, however, that the most successful treatment was the maximal perceptual group (group 6) which incorporated all of the modeling techniques. This group was consistently superior on all types of analysis. Significant differences extended from the .005 to the .025 level when compared with groups one, two, and four. Comparisons with groups three and five, although not significant, showed group six to have the greatest gains and highest mean scores.

Orme's study gave support to the theory that:

... the rate and level of learning a given teaching strategy varies as a function of the mode of model presentation. More specifically, there is evidence to indicate that Perceptual Modeling procedures are characterized by distinctive cueing properties which tend to recommend them over Symbolic Modeling procedures for use in training contexts analogous to those described in the experiment [p. 89].

The minicourse model developed in the Far West Laboratories (Borg, 1968) used filmed illustrations by model teachers rather than any supervisory cueing or evaluation. The only research provided to support this procedure was Orme (1966, cited above), in which perceptual models were found to be as effective as symbolic or supervisory feedback. The fact that Orme found that a combination of models and supervisory feedback was the most effective feedback apparently was not considered important since complete self-instruction was a primary goal of the minicourse. As noted earlier (p. 8), however, the minicourse has produced significant behavioral changes in teachers.

Young (1967) used a video recorded model for training teachers which provided discrimination training with visual prompts and also verbal focus on the second sound track of the video tape. The results
of this study provided support for the use of video tape or film models of teaching skills. Young's study also indicated that discrimination training recorded on the second sound track of a model tape helped to assure that trainees observed the desired skills.

Allen, McDonald and Seidman (1968) reported a number of advantages they derived from using video taped models in their studies at Stanford University. These investigators advocated producing models in a laboratory setting to minimize distractions, to allow focus on a specific skill and to enable responses to be highlighted by key cues. This setting also permitted freedom for experimentation in making the model tape as well as allowing for discussion of taping problems, the retaping of lessons and the possibility of exaggerating aspects of the skill. Thus, the most effective model tape possible could be produced. The investigators indicated that a model tape could allow more rigid control of experimental variables by being shown in a short period of time to all the subjects. Also, model tapes permitted individualized instruction commensurate with the subject's ability to perform so that each subject was allowed a tailored treatment of intensive practice with a diagnostic performance on a number of skills. In their studies to date, the investigators reported that the subjects favored the modeling program.

The most salient feature of the Stanford modeling program was considered to be the use of highly focused brief model lessons on video tape. The investigators felt that this use of video tapes was very applicable to training programs with specialized interests such as the
Peace Corps, the Teacher Corps and inservice teacher programs where veteran teachers resent supervisors.

**Simulation**

Simulation is a technique of imitating reality in a laboratory setting. It is the creation of realistic games to provide participants with life-like problem solving experiences related to their work.

Historically, various forms of simulation have been in existence for a long time. The Greeks had war games. World War II brought about the development of the Link Flight Trainer for simulated pilot exercises. Eastern Airlines used a simulated Boeing 707 for pilot training (Cruickshank, 1967).

Simulation was also used in education, but usually on a far less elaborate and expensive scale. Simulated classroom situations allowed the student teacher to practice classroom teaching behavior through interaction with a filmed or video recorded class. Any practical classroom problem could be created and the student teacher could practice the interaction repeatedly. Rather than learning a precise method of handling specific teaching problems, the objective was to become familiar with a way of operating within behavioral boundaries (Kersh, 1963a). Kersh (Wagner, 1967) indicated that before a student teacher actually faced his first class, through simulation he could experience realistic learning-teaching situations that demanded feedback, and he could acquire understanding for the communication process that might take years to develop in an inservice situation.
Gerbner (Wagner, 1967) indicated that simulation could be used to develop and correct responses on an individual basis. Simulation could lead to correct responses and problem-solving ability through man and machine interaction. The only limitations were the capability of the machine and the nature of the program.

The Higher Education Media Study (Thorton, 1968) reported on two simulation techniques. One program used at Marygrove College in Detroit, Michigan was reportedly developed to provide observational opportunities and student encounters with actual classroom situations. The primary objective was to demonstrate techniques for teaching specific subject matter to children. Video recordings of classroom lessons were photographed and developed into a sequence of colored slides. These so-called audio-slides were shown life-size with audio replay to create an illusion of reality. This audio-slide program was created to help alleviate current teacher training shortages of observational opportunities. Specific objectives of the audio-slide program were uninterrupted previews of classroom situations, observation of theory in practice, evaluation and discussion of other student teacher procedures, replay of programs to facilitate discussion, independent and repetitious viewing, and economic production. Students who used the audio-slide sequences felt that the advantages were: an illusion of participating in an on-going situation, the opportunity to observe and react, the reality of watching and discussing the problems and solutions of other student teachers, and the provision for independent use of the audio-slide program.
Another program reported in the Higher Education Media Study (Thorton, 1968) took place at the University of Oregon. As in the case of Marygrove College, simulation techniques were developed and used in response to a dearth of realistic opportunities for training student teachers. It was felt that the Oregon simulation provided realistic practice by the student without censure or embarrassment, and with the ability to see possible consequences of various actions. A multiple projection simulation technique using "Mr. Land's Sixth Grade Class" was developed and used. This technique was tutorial in nature and required a highly skilled and sensitive teacher educator.

The Teaching Problems Laboratory (Cruickshank, 1967) developed the Longacre Elementary School simulation. Participants assumed the role of Pat Taylor, a beginning fifth grade teacher and practiced solving thirty-one critical teaching problems. Each participant was acquainted with the problems of the school situations by film presentation, through role play, via written descriptions, through filmstrips, handbooks and samples of the children's work. The response by the participant was made on an Incident Response Sheet which included identifying the problem and making a decision on the best course of action. Groups of participants then shared their responses.

In a communications film (Wagner, 1967), another simulation technique at the University of Oregon was shown. In this technique, a preservice teacher was thrust into a realistic classroom via an eight millimeter sound film where he practiced teaching by responding to the screen as if it were a real situation. The illustration depicted in the University of Oregon film presented a student teacher
placing a cartridge in the projector. The film began with an elementary teacher introducing the student teacher to the classroom and saying, "... go right ahead, the class is all yours." The class and the regular teacher then turned and looked to the student teacher who responded as if it were a real situation.

Theoretical Base

The following statements were derived from the cited literature in order to establish a theoretical base for the study:

1. Microteaching provides an effective mode of learning for preservice teachers.
2. Video recording can effectively provide feedback for evaluation of microteaching.
3. Single pedagogical skills can be learned using microteaching and video feedback.
4. Self-instruction is possible through the use of microteaching, video feedback and modeling techniques.
5. Learning is an individual matter and is a function of past experience and learning techniques.
7. Audio-visual models with verbal discrimination are very successful in changing behavior.
8. Simulation can be instrumental in providing meaningful preservice experiences.
Research Hypothesis

From the theoretical base, the following hypothesis was determined to guide the testing of the self-instructional package. Prospective coordinators who use the self-instructional package improve their performance significantly in the following skills and in the composite of these skills as compared with those who do not receive the training:

1. Establishing rapport with an employer in an initial conference.

2. Explaining the cooperative program to an employer.

3. Convincing an employer to provide a training station.
CHAPTER II

THE PROCEDURE

Overview

A self-instructional package on cooperative education coordination skills was developed by the investigator and tested. Each prospective coordinator in an experimental treatment group used the self-instructional package (treatment) to participate in micro-coordination sessions consisting of model viewing, responding to a video recorded employer (stimulus tape) and self analysis. The treatment focused on the development of the three coordination skills of (1) establishing rapport with an employer, (2) explaining the cooperative education program to an employer, and (3) convincing an employer to provide a training station for cooperative education. A random division of the prospective coordinators into two treatment groups (control and experimental) permitted comparisons to be made between the subjects receiving regular classroom instruction (control group) and those using the treatment in addition to regular classroom instruction (experimental group). Video recordings of the subject's stimulus tape responses were made for use as pretests and posttests. The treatment sessions held by the experimental group during the interval between the pretest and posttest were also video recorded to allow self-review and practice for improvement.
Delimitations

This study was limited to: (1) distributive education students, Summer Quarter, 1970, at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; (2) three cooperative education coordination skills of establishing rapport, explaining the program and convincing the employer; and (3) three self-instructional video tapes corresponding to the three coordination skills.

Design

The Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design (Campbell, 1963) was used in the study. This design was appropriate because it helped equate the two treatment groups by using the pretests as covariates in the analysis of covariance. The subjects were stratified according to teaching and coordinating experience and randomly assigned to one of two treatment groups, the control group or the experimental group. Information relative to the subjects' experience in business and education was obtained with the instrument in Appendix C. Both groups participated in an orientation session and a pretest and posttest which measured three coordination skills. In addition to regular classwork, the experimental group worked with the treatment which was designed to help them develop expertise in the three coordination skills. The design is shown in Figure I.
R is randomization.
0₁ and 0₃ are pretests.
0₂ and 0₄ are posttests.
X is the self-instructional package.

Figure I. Pretest-posttest control group design.

Following the posttest, the control group worked with the treatment. This provided the total education class with the same experience and also made it possible for the entire group to respond to the training package opinionnaire.

Self-instructional Package

Each subject in the education class used a self-instructional package (treatment) which was designed to help bridge the gap that exists between preservice methods classes and actual on-the-job confrontation with employers. During a one-week period, each subject was allowed a maximum of six hours of practice time with the treatment and equipment. This practice time was at the convenience of the subjects, but within the time availability of the equipment. Within this six-hour time allotment, each subject used three self-instructional tapes. Each tape included a model interview depicting one skill (see skill models, p. 26), discrimination training, and an employer skill stimulus (see employer-stimulus tapes, p. 25). Self-evaluation of
the subject's response to the employer stimulus tapes was achieved through the use of the critique forms (see instrumentation, p. 27). The subjects were instructed to successively master each of the three coordination skills through repetition of the self-instructional tapes. The number of repetitions necessary for mastering each skill was recorded for each subject. Each subject completed use of the packages by running through all three employer stimuli in succession.

**Employer-Stimulus Tapes**

The employer-stimulus tapes used in the pretest, posttest and self-instructional package, consisted of a technique of simulation used for skill practice. A video recording of an actual employer provided stimuli to which a subject reacted. Each employer-stimulus tape consisted of an employer asking a timed sequence of questions on a specific coordination skill. In this setting, the subject responded verbally to the sequence of questions in order to demonstrate his ability in the identified skill. Two recordings were made by two different employers for each skill. One employer's recording was used for all the pretests and also the self-instructional practice sessions. The second employer's recording was used for all the posttests.
Skill Models

Another aspect of the self-instructional package was the viewing of video taped skill models. The models depicted an experienced coordinator using one of the coordination skills in a three-minute interview with an employer. Discrimination training was added to the video tapes before and after the three-minute model to stress salient features of the skill. There was a model for each of the three skills.

Validation of Model Tapes, Stimulus Tapes and Self-Instructional Package

A jury of vocational researchers, coordinators and employers was consulted while writing the preliminary scripts for the skill model and employer-stimulus tapes. The two employers and the master coordinator who served as models in the tapes spent time becoming familiar with video taping procedures. They practiced role-playing and developed preliminary models. These preliminary models were reviewed by the jury for suggested improvements. A final recording session consisted of taping, reviewing, improving and retaping until each of the model and stimulus tapes was considered suitable for use in the study.

In order to improve and validate the self-instructional package, a prospective distributive education coordinator tried out the package in the treatment setting. He completed the following sequence: the pretest, the posttest, the experimental treatment, and the posttest.
**Instrumentation**

**Critique Forms**

A critique form was developed to evaluate the ability of each subject to utilize the three coordination skills (see Appendix B). This same critique form was used by the evaluation panel (see p. 30) to rate the subjects' pretests and posttests (see p. 29).

The critique forms were based on a format used in the Cotrell studies (1970). The questions in the critique forms were developed from available literature and educational expertise. The critique forms were tested for content validity and face validity by having three vocational educators and one media educator use the critique forms to rate the pretest of the prospective distributive education coordinator who tested the package. The raters suggested slight modifications, but generally considered the items relevant for measurement and in content. The reliability coefficient of the four educators' ratings was .903.

**Opinionnaire**

An opinionnaire was developed for use after the posttests to allow the prospective coordinators to express their attitudes toward the training experience (see Appendix A). This questionnaire was developed from available literature and expertise and validated in the same manner as the critique forms.
Orientation of Subjects

Prior to the pretests, all of the subjects in both the experimental and control groups met together for an orientation. Each subject received a folder containing a personal schedule, the study setting, video equipment instructions, and orientation role playing instructions (see Appendix D). The purpose of the study was explained and the three coordination skills were outlined. In order to clearly show the subjects how they would be involved in the study, video recorded excerpts were presented. The pretest and posttest procedure was demonstrated by showing an excerpt of an employer stimulus tape followed by an excerpt which showed an experienced coordinator responding to the employer stimulus tape. The self-instructional package (treatment) sequence was demonstrated by showing an excerpt of a model tape in which an experienced coordinator was interviewing an employer. It was emphasized that the model coordinator was presenting just one way of interviewing and that his technique and explanations might not fit every interview situation. The critique forms to be used for self-evaluation were shown on the overhead projector to familiarize the subjects with their purpose and use.

Since the self-instructional package involved the use of video tapes and self-recording, part of the orientation was used to train the subjects in equipment operation. The subjects were divided into four groups. Each group was assigned to an instructor who demonstrated video equipment threading, recording and playback procedures. Each subject was permitted to practice the operational procedures until competency was achieved.
During the equipment training session, the subjects also had experience with video recording each other in simulated conferences. Each subject had an opportunity to role play as a distributive education coordinator and as an employer. While this role playing procedure gave each subject a chance to visualize himself in a coordinator's role and an opportunity to operate the equipment, its most important function was to alleviate apprehension about being video recorded under the pretest conditions.

Pretests

Pretest sessions were scheduled, following the orientation, for a one-day period at the convenience of the subjects in both treatment groups. Each pretest consisted of three three-minute video recorded sessions in which each subject responded to stimulus tapes (see p. 25) to demonstrate his ability to use the identified coordination skills.

Posttests

The posttests were held during a one-day period immediately following the experimental group practice sessions with the self-instructional package. Each subject responded to three stimulus tapes (different from the pretest and practice tapes) to demonstrate his ability to use the three conference skills.
Evaluation Panel

Two experienced distributive education supervisors from the staff of the State of Ohio Department of Education served as a panel to evaluate the pretests and posttests. They were familiarized with the study and trained to rate the pretests and posttests. The training procedure was continued until there was reliability of ratings between the two panel members. A critique form was used for the ratings (see instrumentation, p. 27).

Data Collection and Analysis

Data for computer analysis were provided by the panel evaluations of the pretests and posttests which consisted of interval data with five intervals ranging from unsuccessful to excellent. The control and experimental groups were compared on each of the identified skills and on the combined skills. The posttest data were subjected to an analysis of covariance, with the pretest data serving as a covariate, in order to determine if significant differences existed between the two treatment groups in the specified coordination skills. It was established that the null hypothesis was accepted or rejected at the .05 level of significance. The analysis was done on the IBM 360 computer using the BMD04V program. The pretest data were tested to insure that they were suitable for use as a covariate (Dixon, 1962, BMD02V). Paired t-tests were also used to determine pretest to posttest improvement on each skill (Golhar, 1968).
Facilities and Equipment

This study was conducted at The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Columbus, Ohio. The auditorium was used for the orientation. The media laboratory and one conference room were used to conduct the pretests, posttests and self-instructional package.

The equipment necessary for this study was four one-half inch video recording systems. Two systems were required for each self-instructional package. One system was used for playback of the self-instructional package and required only the video tape recorder and the monitor. The second system was used for recording the coordinator reacting to the stimulus tape and in addition to the video tape recorder and monitor, required a camera and microphone. This equipment was made available by The Center for Vocational and Technical Education and The Distributive Education Instructional Materials Laboratory. In addition, fifty one-half inch video tapes were made available by The Center.

Participants

Prospective Coordinators

A group of twenty-three preservice coordinators enrolled in a distributive education methods of teaching class under the direction of Dr. Neal Vivian were the subjects for the study. One student from the control group did not participate which left each treatment group with eleven subjects.
Master Coordinator

An experienced vocational coordinator, Mr. Thomas Hephner, was selected to role play in the skill model recordings. He had a master's degree in cooperative education and was experienced in distributive education. The latter characteristic correlated with the specialty area of the subjects.

Employers

Two employers with cooperative education experience participated in the study. Mr. Dave Godfrey played the role of the employer for one stimulus recording. A second employer, Mr. Richard Weirich, was involved in the production of the model tapes for each of the coordination skills and a second stimulus recording. Both men were selected on the basis of business experience, cooperative education experience and willingness to participate in the study.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This chapter presents the results and discussion of results in testing the hypothesis and the analysis of the opinionnaire.

Testing the Hypothesis

The null hypothesis tested in this study was:

Prospective coordinators who use the self-instructional package do not improve their performance significantly in the following skills and in the composite of these skills as compared with those who do not receive the training:

1. Establishing rapport with an employer.
2. Explaining the cooperative program to an employer.
3. Convincing an employer to provide a training station.

The hypothesis was tested by comparing the posttest performance of the two treatment groups. A secondary analysis determined differences in pretest to posttest performance for all the subjects. Before the hypothesis was tested, the pretest and posttest data were tested for reliability to insure consistent rating by the evaluation panel.

Reliability Test

An analysis of variance was used for the reliability test (Winer, 1962). The results of the analysis (Table I) showed a range of .745 to .922 for the pretest and a range of .815 to .916 for the
posttest. Based upon a perfect reliability coefficient of 1.000, the derived coefficients were considered very acceptable.

**TABLE I. Reliability Ratings of Evaluation Panel (Analysis of Variance)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing rapport</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining the program</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing the employer</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined skills</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Posttest Performance**

A comparison of the posttest performance of the treatment groups was used to determine if significant differences existed between the treatment groups. An analysis of covariance was used with the pretest scores as covariates.

There were no significant differences between the treatment groups on the pretest performance scores. Therefore, the pretest data were judged suitable for use as covariates. The results of the pretest analysis are shown in Appendix E. The derived F values for each skill and the combined skill were .3918, .6815, .5239 and .6743, respectively. According to the points for distribution of F table (Downie and Heath, 1965), the F value had to be greater than 4.35 to be significant at the .05 level.

The data from the covariance analysis comparing the treatment groups on posttest performance are shown in Tables 2 and 3. No significant differences were found between the groups at the .05 level.
Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted and the research hypothesis was not supported in this test.

A close look at the posttest performance data revealed that differences did exist although they were not statistically significant at the level established for this test. In each of the skills, the mean score was greater for the experimental group. Also, the mean scores adjusted to compensate for differences in pretest performance scores (covariates) indicated greater accomplishment for the experimental group. In addition, the F values on the scores for the skill of convincing the employer and on the combined skills were large enough to be significant at the .10 level. These results might be interpreted as indicators of trends. Perhaps variations in some of the factors involved in the study would significantly improve the subject performance. For instance, the subjects used the training package for up to six hours over a one-week period. Periodic use of the package over a semester or quarter, throughout the school year or at the beginning of the junior year and at the end of the senior year might produce more significant results. Another variation that could affect the results of the study would be sample size. These trends would have been more clearly defined in a considerably larger sample. More variation in employers for the stimulus tapes might have reinforced the trends by providing a wider experience for the students. Also, more model interviews could have provided a greater bank of illustrations upon which the students could draw.
TABLE 2. Posttest Performance Means of the Treatment Groups on Each Skill and the Combined Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
<th>SE of Adjusted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.6982</td>
<td>3.7197</td>
<td>0.1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.5509</td>
<td>3.5294</td>
<td>0.1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.5282</td>
<td>3.5523</td>
<td>0.1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.3182</td>
<td>3.2940</td>
<td>0.1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convince</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.6009</td>
<td>3.6559</td>
<td>0.1624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.2827</td>
<td>3.2278</td>
<td>0.1624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.6064</td>
<td>3.6456</td>
<td>0.1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.3264</td>
<td>3.2871</td>
<td>0.1387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3. Covariance Data for Posttest Performance of Treatment Groups on Each Skill and the Combined Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>Treatment (Between)</td>
<td>.1954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1954</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error (Within)</td>
<td>5.4122</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.2849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Treatment (Between)</td>
<td>.3548</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3548</td>
<td>1.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error (Within)</td>
<td>5.5132</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.2902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convince</td>
<td>Treatment (Between)</td>
<td>.9824</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9824</td>
<td>3.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error (Within)</td>
<td>5.4426</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.2865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Treatment (Between)</td>
<td>.6841</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6841</td>
<td>3.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error (Within)</td>
<td>3.9551</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.2082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P .05 = 4.35 (with 1 and 19 degrees of freedom).

Pretest to Posttest Gain

For the experimental group, the pretest to posttest analysis by paired t-test indicated a significant difference in performance at the .05 level on the skills of explaining the program and convincing
the employer and on the combined skills. For the control group, there were no significant differences in pretest to posttest performance at the .05 level. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.

This analysis was computed to provide additional information regarding the performance of the two treatment groups. The experimental group improved significantly at the .05 level on two skills and the combined skills while the control group did not improve significantly on any skill. In addition, there was significant improvement at the .10 level on the skill of rapport for the experimental group. In contrast, the control group did not improve significantly at the .10 level on any skill. These data support the trends evident in the posttest performance data. A close look at the t-test data indicated a wide divergence in the amount of improvement of the two treatment groups. As previously noted, the experimental group improved significantly at the .05 level on all but one skill. In contrast, the control group improvement was almost nonexistent. The variations in this study suggested in the discussion of posttest performance (p. 35) should also produce further improvement in any group using the self-instructional package.

Summary

While the research hypothesis was not supported by the main test at the predetermined level of significance, the evidence tended to indicate a trend toward superiority in performance of the experimental group; i.e., the covariance analysis indicated a difference significant at the .10 level and the paired t-test indicated pretest
TABLE 4. Paired t-test Data for Pretest to Posttest Performance of Treatment Groups on Each Skill and the Combined Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.2673</td>
<td>3.6982</td>
<td>.4942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.4227</td>
<td>3.5509</td>
<td>.6104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.1236</td>
<td>3.5282</td>
<td>.3982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.2718</td>
<td>3.3182</td>
<td>.4046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convince</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.1445</td>
<td>3.6009</td>
<td>.3872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.2809</td>
<td>3.2827</td>
<td>.4528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.1800</td>
<td>3.6064</td>
<td>.3623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.3254</td>
<td>3.3264</td>
<td>.4273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P .05 = 2.23 (with 10 degrees of freedom).

*Significant at the .05 level.
to posttest improvement for the experimental group which was significant at the .05 level.

In addition to the previously stated results and discussion, data and comments are available in Appendix F on subject practice sessions and experience versus results.

Results of the Opinionnaire

An opinionnaire (Appendix A) was used to collect data on all the subjects' opinions regarding their attitudes toward the training package. Nineteen out of twenty-two subjects completed the questionnaire. The opinionnaire had fourteen questions asking for yes or no responses and explanations. The following discussion summarizes the comments and opinions taken from this instrument.

Item 1.—Were you pleased with your first appearance on video tape in this study? Yes No

   How did you feel?

Sixty-three percent of the participants responded no and thirty-seven percent yes. This item was more concerned with the subjects' feelings regarding self-confrontation than actual attitude toward the study. The item was designed to allow the subjects to express themselves on a possibly frustrating issue and become personally involved in expressing their attitudes on the subsequent items. Some of the comments regarding the item were as follows: "apprehensive"
"ill-at-ease", "surprised at some of my actions", "relaxed", "self-conscious--silly", "tense", "I felt alright, but I sounded funny", "awkward", "... didn't like what I saw, but glad to analyze as others see me", "surprised at the number of involuntary movement of hands and feet", and "spoke too quickly--timing bad--yet, in real life, the employer would pick up where I left off."

Item 2.—Was viewing yourself on television during this study helpful to you? Yes No

How did you feel when your recording sessions were completed?

All of the responses were yes. Comments such as, "... was made aware of many weaknesses in communications," "... gained confidence from interviewing employer," "... helped me a lot," "... more confident, but need more practice," and "... much room for improvement," indicated the general feeling regarding self-viewing.

Item 3.—Did the orientation session adequately prepare you to participate in the study? Yes No

How could the orientation have better prepared you for the study?

Ninety percent of the participants responded yes, and only ten percent responded no. The participants who suggested improvements for the orientation session gave the following comments: "might be extended over two days to portray an ease to adjust to gadgetry;" "explain more about the over-all purpose;" and "time element and treatment could have been more thoroughly explained."

Item 4.—Should the training package used in this study be a permanent part of the course you are taking? Yes No

When would be the most appropriate time to use this training package?
Eighty-four percent of the subjects accepted the idea of keeping the training package in the course. The comments were as follows: "During class time--some on package and others in other work," "the last two weeks in the course would be preferable because each student is anxious to relate at that time," "... early in course," "at the beginning of the course to give the feel of being a coordinator," and "I think it should be available for use, but not compulsory." Two comments accompanying the unfavorable subjects' reactions were: "A separate course should be established for this training or else this course should be raised from three to five hours credit," and "... should be in the coordination class."

Item 5.--Would you have volunteered to participate in this study? Yes No

What are your reasons?

Fifty-eight percent of the participants responded yes and forty-two percent no. Those who would have volunteered explained why as follows: "I am going to be a coordinator in the fall," "everyone should grade himself against a standard," "learning to operate the video tape equipment," "interest in new teaching tools," and "this is good exposure to a basic ingredient of teaching--meeting people, instructing and interacting." The objections, in each case, were "lack of time".

Item 6.--Do you believe that prospective coordinators can acquire cooperative education coordination skills through the use of self-instructional training packages like those used in this study? Yes No

Why?
Ninety-five percent of the responses were favorable. Among the favorable comments were the following: "We see ourselves as we appear to others," "... allows application and practice of skills," "... realistic in some ways--gain confidence and learn what to say," "... able to evaluate results," "you are only competing with your-self--relatively little pressure," and "practice sessions allow the coordinator to become more relaxed when confronting an employer who is often considerably older." Only one subject reacted unfavorably and stated, "Did not give printed situation far enough ahead and did not allow time for study."

Item 7.—Did the self-instructional package used in this study help you to develop the three coordination skills?

a. establishing rapport
b. explaining DE
c. convincing employers

Why?

Comments following the favorable responses were: "I became more aware of what distributive education is and how I should better apply the facts," "I learned more about the program and how to get it across," "it reinforced the learning, focusing was possible," "with little experience at these skills, it is helpful to see it very well done by an experienced coordinator," and "the time limit for each section forced one to organize his response." Establishing rapport had a 69 percent favorable response, explaining the program had 95 percent favorable response, and convincing the employer had 90 percent favorable response. Two unfavorable comments were, "... developed over-all skill, but not a particular skill," and "the first section seemed irrelevant and I could not identify with it."
Item 3.—If this training package were available in the future, would you use it again?  Yes  No

Why?

Seventy-nine percent of the participants responded yes and twenty-one percent no. The explanations of the unfavorable responses were all the same and said, "would use a similar (but different) package." Some of the favorable comments were as follows: "It would further reinforce approved techniques as we see ourselves in the mirror of the camera," "would improve coordination and classroom teaching," "more practice needed," "want to improve-evaluate," "I would need the training on a more continuous basis—perhaps once a week for a quarter," "if available on a voluntary basis at times of my choice," "forces a critical analysis," and "helps you self-actualize your communication ability."

Item 9.—Would you recommend this training package to other students?  Yes  No

Why?

All of the participants responded "yes". The following comments were indicative of why it was recommended: "helpful", "allow others to adjust to Robert Burns' idea of seeing ourselves as others see us," "it is a help in actual practice in what you will be doing," "builds confidence," "if offered in a voluntary manner," "overcome fear of speaking," "help establish techniques for new coordinators," and "this is a way in which the student can find out how he looks and sounds on the job and get insights into what an employer-coordinator interview is like."

Item 10.—Were the model interviews on each skill with Dick and Tom helpful?

a. establishing rapport
b. explaining DE
c. convincing employers

How could each model interview be improved?
Seventy-four percent of the participants responded yes and twenty-six percent no on the model of establishing rapport. The response was one hundred percent yes on the model of explaining DE and ninety-five percent yes and five percent no on the model of convincing employers. One suggestion for improving all the model interviews was as follows: "they were really good, but not that realistic to what we had to do in following, i.e., when Dick asked Tom a question, Tom answered and Dick started up again. We didn't get the same treatment. We had to judge when the interviewer would start up again which caused a nervousness of how am I going to finish what I have to say or when is he going to start up again." Other comments were, "could be lengthened," "different individuals should act as employer," and "don't think it could be substantially improved."

Item II.---Were the employer stimulus tapes you used to practice each skill helpful?
   a. establishing rapport
   b. explaining DE
   c. convincing employers

   How could each stimulus tape be improved?

Parts "b" and "c" had unanimous yes responses. Part "a" had a ninety percent yes response. Some suggestions for improvement were as follows: "... give a better idea of the amount of time given to answer," "... more realistic, positive and negative," "adequate," and "... cut out small talk, businessmen are busy."

Item 12.---Was each critique form you used for self-evaluation helpful?
   a. establishing rapport
   b. explaining DE
   c. convincing employers

   How could each critique form be improved?
Eighty-four percent of the participants responded yes to part "a", and ninety-five percent responded yes to parts "b" and "c". Comments following favorable responses were, "it was adequate," "... detected weak areas to concentrate on," "not all items were helpful," and "a person could actually see his own weaknesses." One additional comment asked for, "... evaluation by other prospective coordinators." The comment from one subject who responded no to all three skills was, "I don't feel they are necessary. Inside you know how you've done, but are sometimes reluctant to put it on paper."

Item 13.--Did this training package help prepare you to interview employers? Yes No

In general, how could it be improved?

All the participants responded yes to this question. General suggestions for improving the package were as follows: "if we knew what the questions were," "use different employers," "use live persons for the interview," "... less structured and rigid, if possible," "add a switch to stop action until you feel your answer is complete," and "... better time spacing."

Item 14.--If The Center for Vocational and Technical Education and the DE Materials Laboratory conduct a post-study survey of this class in December, would you be willing to respond to a questionnaire? Yes No

Why?

Ninety-five percent of the responses were favorable. The following comments expressed the general attitude that seemed to permeate this whole group during the study. "I am interested in anything that would improve training in the field," "I felt it was interesting," "to be of help to other students and coordinators,"
"help the program and its future," "by this time in the fall I will be in a coordinator's setting," "... interest in project," and "may be helpful to improve study."

Summary

In general, the reaction to the training package, as measured by the opinionnaire, was very favorable. Items regarding the helpfulness of the self-instructional package in developing coordination skills and providing preparation for interviewing employers received an average of eighty-five percent favorable response. The general tone of any unfavorable reaction on the opinionnaire was in the form of constructive improvement. Some of the improvements were for an extended orientation period, voluntary training package usage over an extended period of time, more variety in training packages, a better indication of when the employer in the stimulus tapes would begin each question, use of more and different employers, and more than just self-evaluation.
The Problem

The purpose of this study was to develop and test a prototypic preservice training program in selected cooperative education coordination skills. To accomplish this purpose, the following specific objectives were established: (1) to develop a self-instructional package on cooperative education coordination skills for prospective coordinators; (2) to determine the effect of a self-instructional package on prospective coordinators' performance in the three coordination skills of: (a) establishing rapport with an employer in an initial conference, (b) explaining the cooperative program to an employer, and (c) convincing an employer to provide a training station; and (3) to determine the prospective coordinators' opinion of the value of the self-instructional package and to receive suggestions on how to improve it.

Training Package

A self-instructional package was developed for the three cooperative education coordination skills. This package consisted of model
viewing, receiving discrimination training, responding to video recorded employers and self-analysis.

Procedure

The Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design (Campbell, 1963) was used for this study. The subjects were stratified according to teaching and coordinating experience and then randomly divided into two treatment groups, a control group and an experimental group.

The following null hypothesis was developed to guide the testing of the self-instructional package:

Prospective coordinators who use the self-instructional package do not improve their performance significantly in the following skills and in the composite of these skills as compared with those who do not receive the training: (1) establishing rapport with an employer; (2) explaining the cooperative program to an employer; and (3) convincing an employer to provide a training station.

All twenty-two subjects received an orientation and were pretested (video recorded responding to an employer stimulus tape) on the three coordination skills. The experimental group practiced the coordination skills using the training package. Both treatment groups attended regular class sessions. Both groups were posttested responding to a different employer stimulus tape. The control group practiced the coordination skills and both groups filled out an opinionnaire on the training package. The pretests and posttests were evaluated by a two-member panel and the data were analyzed by computer.
Analysis

An analysis of covariance was used to test the hypothesis by comparing the treatment groups on posttest performance using the pretests as a covariate. The .05 level of significance was established for the test. Another analysis tested for pretest to posttest improvement for the subjects on each skill.

Major Findings

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between the treatment groups on posttest performance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted and the research hypothesis was not supported by this test. It was noted, however, that differences significant at the .10 level did occur on the skill of convincing the employer and on the combined skills. Also of interest was the fact that according to the adjusted means, some difference did exist on all the skills although it was not significant at the .05 level. A significant difference was verified by a paired t-test analysis for pretest to posttest improvement. The experimental group improved significantly at the .10 level on the skill of establishing rapport and at the .05 level on the skills of explaining the program and convincing the employer, and the combined skills while the control group made no significant improvement.

The prospective coordinators' reaction to the opinionnaire indicated very strong support for the self-instructional package. A major advantage of the self-instructional package appeared to be the opportunity it provided for practicing coordination skills which made the participants aware of weaknesses in communication and
specifically helped them gain confidence in interviewing employers. Other advantages seemed to be self-viewing, self-analysis, relatively little pressure, another way to learn about distributive education, overcoming fear of speaking, and gaining insight into the actual nature of employer interviews. A disadvantage of the self-instructional package seemed to be the lack of opportunity for interaction with the employer during reactions to the employer stimulus tapes.

Suggestions for improving the self-instructional package included: using a greater variety of employers for the stimulus and model tapes, using a greater variety of coordinators for the model tapes, and using the package over an extended period of time.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based upon the evidence obtained from testing the instructional package. Both the statistical results on performance and subjective reactions of the participants have been considered.

1. The self-instructional training package improved the prospective coordinators' performance on the skills for which it was designed. While the high level of significance set for the primary test was not met, some differences at the .10 level were obtained. Also, other test results supported this conclusion.

2. The self-instructional package was judged feasible as a training device for new coordinators to bridge the gap between college courses and actual face-to-face confrontation with
an employer who must be convinced to provide a training station for a cooperative education student. This conclusion is supported by the overwhelming enthusiasm of the prospective coordinators experiencing the training package as evidenced by their subjective reactions to the evaluation opinionnaire. Also, their performance scores support this conclusion.

3. The self-instructional package for the development of coordination skills in convincing employers to provide training stations was appraised as being highly suitable in preservice distributive teacher education courses or workshops which include such a training objective. This conclusion is supported by the generally favorable reaction to the package by the prospective coordinators and by specific comments made on the opinionnaire to this effect. The improvement in the coordination skills by the experimental group also supports this conclusion.

4. The self-instructional package required a minimum of personnel and resources to facilitate individualized instruction which may be scheduled at the convenience of the prospective coordinator. The success of this feasibility study indicates the instructional value which may accrue from simulation, i.e., an employer stimulus tape, video recording and feedback for self-evaluation. The cost of this package is small when compared with the cost
of providing actual employers for interview practice and master coordinators or teacher educators and employers for feedback evaluation.

Recommendations

Based on the results and conclusions in the study, the following recommendations were made for the future use of self-instructional training packages in cooperative education.

This training package should be used in preservice distributive teacher education courses and workshops.

This training package should be modified for use in the other vocational service areas and used accordingly. Since students in these service areas often have less sales experience, the package should be even more effective than in distributive education.

The training package video tapes should be put on 8mm or 16mm sound film. This would provide a larger image and reduce the number of video recorder systems required.

Either an intensive training program should be held on equipment operation for those who need it, or a technician should be on duty whenever the training package is available. Some of the subjects acclimated very quickly to the video recording equipment and used it with little difficulty. However, some students consistently experienced considerable difficulty with the equipment.

Additional methods of evaluating the student reaction to the employer stimulus tape should be tried such as peer and employer evaluation.
The use of additional employer stimulus tapes and employer-coordinator model interviews would provide more variety and a broader experience for trainees.

Some type of unobtrusive, yet obvious, audio or visual signal should be used in the employer stimulus tapes about five seconds before the employer speaks to definitely cue the trainee.

The critique forms should be further refined and developed.

**Implications for Future Research**

Research is needed to determine minimum and maximum limits for coordination skill mastery to facilitate the scheduling of equipment and facilities. In this study, up to six hours of practice time with the training package was allowed. Each subject used each skill tape at least once and was encouraged to practice the skill until mastery was accomplished.

More research is necessary to determine the possibility of using peer, employer, or teacher educator evaluation with self-evaluation. A number of subjects in the study were very anxious to have the investigator review their recorded responses.

Replication of this study in distributive education and also modification of the study for the other vocational service areas is recommended to verify the results and conclusions.

Self-instructional packages for other coordination skills should be developed and tested.
Please respond to the following questions by circling yes or no and explaining your answer.

1. Were you pleased with your first appearance on video tape in this study?
   YES  NO
   How did you feel?

2. Was viewing yourself on television during this study helpful to you?
   YES  NO
   How did you feel when your recording sessions were completed?

3. Did the orientation session adequately prepare you to participate in the study?
   YES  NO
   How could the orientation have better prepared you for the study?

4. Should the training package used in this study be a permanent part of the course you are taking?
   YES  NO
   When would be the most appropriate time to use this training package?
5. Would you have volunteered to participate in this study?
YES   NO
What are your reasons?

6. Do you believe that prospective coordinators can acquire cooperative education coordination skills through the use of self-instructional training packages like those used in this study?
YES   NO
Why?

7. Did the self-instructional package used in this study help you to develop the three coordination skills?
   a. establishing rapport  YES   NO
   b. explaining DE        YES   NO
   c. convincing employers  YES   NO
Why?

8. If this training package were available in the future, would you use it again?
YES   NO
Why?

9. Would you recommend this training package to other students?
YES   NO
Why?
10. Were the model interviews on each skill with Dick and Tom helpful?
   a. establishing rapport  YES  NO
   b. explaining DE  YES  NO
   c. convincing employers  YES  NO

   How could each model interview be improved?

11. Were the employer stimulus tapes you used to practice each skill helpful?
   a. establishing rapport  YES  NO
   b. explaining DE  YES  NO
   c. convincing employers  YES  NO

   How could each stimulus tape be improved?

12. Was each critique form you used for self-evaluation helpful?
   a. establishing rapport  YES  NO
   b. explaining DE  YES  NO
   c. convincing employers  YES  NO

   How could each critique form be improved?

13. Did this training package help prepare you to interview employers?
    YES  NO

    In general, how could it be improved?

14. If The Center for Vocational and Technical Education and The DE Materials Laboratory conduct a post-study survey of this class in December, would you be willing to respond to a questionnaire?
    YES  NO

    Why?
APPENDIX B

CRITIQUE FORMS

Introduction

The following pages consist of questions designed to help you evaluate your reaction to the stimulus tapes. There is one page of questions for each of the three coordination skills of Establishing Rapport, Explaining the Program and Convincing the Employer.

Some of the questions relate specifically to only one of the skills, while some, more general questions, appear under more than one of the skills.

In order to facilitate continuity of thought for everyone using these critique forms, some examples of terms are given below to clarify the specific emphasis desired.

ON RAPPORT:

Question 7 "enthusiastic"—Were you academic and factual, or did you show (by your enthusiasm) that you personally believed in and fully supported the program?

Question 8 "positive"—Were you skeptical and unsure, or did you (positively) present and reinforce your program?

ON EXPLAIN:

Question 8 "information essential to the employer"—This means not trying to tell the employer everything you know about distributive education.
ON CONVINCE:

Question 2 "realistically"—If the employer was skeptical that your students might not want to follow company policies, for example, did you admit that the problem existed but could be solved?
Self Evaluation Form
Skill No. 1
Establishing Rapport

Prospective Coordinator's Name

In your work as a coordinator, there will be many situations in which you will need to establish rapport with someone. One situation will be when you are trying to arrange new training stations for your students. In your quest for training stations, your ability to establish rapport with an employer in the initial employer-coordinator conference will be very important to your success.

The items listed below are designed to help you evaluate your own success in establishing rapport. Check the box which best describes how well you accomplished the item.

1. Did you cordially greet the employer (call him by name)?
2. Did you properly introduce yourself (name and school)?
3. Did you seek to establish interaction by appealing to the employer's interests?
4. Were you free from the use of distracting gestures (twisting your ring, etc.)?
5. Was your speech free from hesitation (ahhh...)?
6. Did you listen well (maintain eye contact and express comprehension through facial reaction)?
7. Were you enthusiastic?
8. Were you positive?
SELF EVALUATION FORM

SKILL NO. 2

EXPLAINING THE PROGRAM

In an initial visit with an employer who is unfamiliar with the program, the employer will want information about the distributive education program. You should know the facts about this cooperative program and be able to explain them succinctly.

The items listed below are designed to help you evaluate your own success in explaining the distributive education program. Check the box which best describes HOW WELL you ACCOMPLISHED the item.

1. Did you explain that the student's classroom experiences would be closely related to the training station experiences?

2. Did you make it clear that the main objective of the training station is education?

3. Did you explain the employer's training responsibilities?

4. Did you present your explanation in an understandable orderly manner?

5. Did you use available time effectively (within the time limit, did you get to the main point of your answer or were you just beginning; were your answers too brief to be adequate)?

6. When the employer asked you a series of questions at one time, did you discuss every point?

7. When the employer asked a long and involved question, did you wait until he finished before responding?

8. Were your answers limited to the information which was essential to the employer?

Prospective Coordinator's Name
Once you have decided you would like to establish a training station with a particular employer, you must convince him that your program is important to his firm; i.e., you must provide him with a rationale for becoming a distributive education training sponsor.

The items listed below are designed to help you evaluate your own success in convincing the employer to provide a training station. Check the box which best describes how well you accomplished the item.

1. Was your explanation of the coordinator's role a convincing factor? □ □ □ □ □ □
2. Did you react realistically when the employer posed problems? □ □ □ □ □ □
3. Was your explanation of potential full-time, "custom-trained" employees a convincing factor? □ □ □ □ □ □
4. Did you convince the employer that the close relationship between the school and his business would provide him with a more effective training program for his workers? □ □ □ □ □ □
5. Was your explanation of how the distributive education program helps students to become stable, mature, contributing members of society convincing? □ □ □ □ □ □
6. Were your answers confident, yet not dogmatic? □ □ □ □ □ □
7. Did you use available time effectively (within the time limit, did you get to the main point of your answer or were you just beginning; were your answers too brief to be adequate)? □ □ □ □ □ □
APPENDIX C

SUBJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME:________________________________________

ADDRESS:_____________________________________

PHONE: HOME - __________________ BUSINESS - ______________

SEX: M F

OCCUPATION:__________________________ SEX: M F

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

Present Program (Ph.D., M.A., etc.) __________________________

Subject Area (Major) _______________________________________

EXPERIENCE:

Years of Retail Experience ____________________________

Years of Other Work Experience ____________________________

Cooperative Experience as a High School Student

Years of Coordinating Experience ___________________________

Years of Teaching Experience ____________________________
APPENDIX D

Instructions for Using
Self-Instructional Package

The sequence of activities on these three video tapes (1) Establishing Rapport with an Employer, (2) Explaining the Distributive Education Program to an Employer, and (3) Convincing the Employer to Provide a Training Station will be as follows:

1. Introduction
2. Skill model*
3. Model evaluation
4. Practice session
5. Self-evaluation instruction

*These skill models demonstrate only one coordinator's method and opinion regarding the three skills. You are encouraged to use your own information and creativity in your practice sessions with the employer.

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES:

1. Set up the machine according to instructions.
2. Run the tape up to about 20, begin playing and follow the instructions in the tape.
3. Use the appropriate critique form to evaluate your responses to the employer.
4. Replay the tape, in total, or particularly the last two parts, until you are satisfied with your skill ability.
CONFERENCE SETTING

You are a distributive education coordinator about to interview an employer, hopefully to establish a training station. The high school that has just hired you is starting a distributive education program for the first time. The high school is one of many in a big city school system.

The employer is the personnel manager of a large department store in a local shopping center. You contacted this employer by phone, briefly described your distributive education program and its purpose and arranged for this interview.

As the video tape begins, you have just walked into the employer's office and sat down. The employer will greet you, and you may respond by identifying yourself and your business.

Assume your own distributive education program setting and respond to the three employer sequences. The three sequences will be:

1. Establishing Rapport with an Employer
2. Explaining the Distributive Education Program
3. Convincing the Employer to Provide a Training Station.

Each section will be identified in the tape. Try to utilize the coordination skill which is appropriate in each section.
ROLE PLAY

Participants: - one experienced D E coordinator.
- one employer unfamiliar with D E.
- one equipment operator.

(Assume previously described conference setting)

1. ESTABLISHING RAPPORT (one minute)
   Introduce yourselves and then engage in small talk about the school, the business, personal interests, and etc.

2. EXPLAINING PROGRAM (one minute)
   Employer should ask the coordinator to explain D E and then employer and coordinator interact with questions and answers which further clarify the program.

3. CONVINCING THE EMPLOYER (one minute)
   Employer should ask the coordinator how the D E program will benefit his business and then employer and coordinator interact with further questions.
APPENDIX E

PRETEST DATA

TABLE I. Means and Standard Deviation of the Treatment Groups on Pretest Performance on Each Skill and the Combined Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.2673</td>
<td>.5183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.4227</td>
<td>.6401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.1236</td>
<td>.4176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.2718</td>
<td>.4243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convince</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.1445</td>
<td>.4061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.2809</td>
<td>.4749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.1800</td>
<td>.3799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.3254</td>
<td>.4481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. Analysis of Variance-Multiple Range Test on Pretest Performance of Each Skill and the Combined Skills Using the Mean of the Two Panel Members' Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.1329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1329</td>
<td>.3918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>6.7844</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.3392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.1208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1208</td>
<td>.6815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3.5444</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.1772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convince</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.1023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1023</td>
<td>.5239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3.9040</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>.1164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1164</td>
<td>.6743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3.4515</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.1726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p .05 = 4.35 (with 1 and 20 degrees of freedom).
APPENDIX F

Additional Results

Practice Sessions versus Results

A record was kept of the amount of self-instructional practice time used by the experimental group and also, the number of times they critiqued their recordings. A summary of this data and the gain or regression in pretest to posttest skill performance mean is shown in Table III. Based on visual observation, there did not appear to be any correlation between the amount of practice and the mean differences. This result tended to support an advantage of self-instructional packages, which was that students could proceed at their own mastery rate.

Experience versus Results

The sample used in this study was stratified according to years of coordinating experience and teaching experience and randomly divided into two groups. The amount of experience and the gain or regression in pretest to posttest skill performance mean is shown in Table IV. There was a wide variation in results of the subjects with teaching and coordinating experience. Subject four, with eighteen years of teaching experience and usage of the package did very poorly. Subject twenty-one, with two years of teaching, three years of coordinating, and no package usage also did very poorly. In contrast, subject sixteen, with only one year of teaching and no package usage did the best. Based on visual observation, these two groups of experienced subjects did not appear to perform exceptionally different. Their experience may have superseded any self-instructional package effect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Practice Time</th>
<th>Critiques</th>
<th>Rapport Gain</th>
<th>Rapport Loss</th>
<th>Explain Gain</th>
<th>Explain Loss</th>
<th>Convince Gain</th>
<th>Convince Loss</th>
<th>Combined Gain</th>
<th>Combined Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 1/2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Teaching Years</td>
<td>Coordinating Years</td>
<td>Rapport Gain</td>
<td>Rapport Loss</td>
<td>Explain Gain</td>
<td>Explain Loss</td>
<td>Convince Gain</td>
<td>Convince Loss</td>
<td>Combined Gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14*</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21*</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Experience in teaching and/or coordinating.
The following coordination skill scripts constituted the audio portion of the video recorded self-instructional packages. Each package consisted of an introduction, a model interview, discrimination training, and instructions for self-evaluation. The scripts are presented in the following sequence: Establishing Rapport, Explaining the Cooperative Education Program, and Convincing the Employer.

Establishing Rapport

INTRODUCTION

DISCRIMINATOR: Hello, I'm Fred Harrington. This is the first of three video tapes designed to help familiarize you with the techniques involved in conducting an employer coordinator conference for the purpose of establishing a training station. In these three video tapes we will work on three skills associated with such a conference. We will concentrate on the first skill in this tape. This skill will be establishing rapport with an employer. In the second tape we will work on the skill of explaining the distributive education program to the employer, in the third tape we will work on the skill of convincing the employer to provide a training station.

Let's now work on the skill of establishing rapport. The model you are about to see takes place in the office of Dick Weirich. He is the personnel manager of a large department store in a local shopping center. The coordinator in this interview is Tom Hephner, an experienced coordinator who has just taken on the job of starting a new DE program at South High School. Prior to this interview Tom called Dick on the phone, briefly described the DE program to him, and arranged this meeting. Let's take a look at the model.
MODEL (Tape depicting a Coordinator Establishing Rapport with an Employer.)

COORDINATOR: Good morning Mr. Weirich, my name is Tom Hephner.

EMPLOYER: Glad to know you Tom, I'm Dick.

COORDINATOR: I talked to you earlier this week about distributive education. I'm from South High School and we're starting a new program in distributive education next fall.

EMPLOYER: I certainly appreciate your phone call. I am just a little bit familiar with the school. As for the phone call, it does help us a great deal here to be able to plan things in advance. Right now I'm planning a trip to Canada.

COORDINATOR: Oh, you are. Fine, where are you going?

EMPLOYER: Well, we're going on up above Montreal a little bit. We're going to try out some of the fishing equipment here at the store.

COORDINATOR: That's beautiful country, beautiful.

EMPLOYER: We're really looking forward to it.

COORDINATOR: How long do you think you will be gone?

EMPLOYER: About two weeks. It's been a long time since I've been on vacation so I'm looking forward to it.

COORDINATOR: It should make a real nice trip, Dick.

EMPLOYER: As far as your phone call is concerned, I do want to say that from a public relations standpoint we certainly are interested in what's going on in the schools these days.

COORDINATOR: Fine.

EMPLOYER: I'm interested in finding out what you have to say, Tom.

COORDINATOR: Well, you are familiar with South High School.

EMPLOYER: I know a little bit about it. In terms of a question I might ask how's the football team going to do next year?

COORDINATOR: Well, there's no place to go but up. You know we lost just about all of our games last year. We had a little bit of tough luck at the beginning of the season but it looks like it's going to be a real fine season. We've got some young fellows coming up that I think are pretty fine athletes.
EMPLOYER: It would be great if your football team could do as well as the debate team. I understand they were state champs last year.

COORDINATOR: Well, they've been state champs for the last four out of five years I believe. We've got quite an unusual debate team.

EMPLOYER: I didn't realize that they had won in the past too.

COORDINATOR: Well, that's alright. We've got to get the football team on the same level as the debate team, there's no question about it.

EMPLOYER: I'm curious about something else, too. How many students will be graduating this year?

COORDINATOR: We hope to graduate 450 next June, and this is of a total enrollment in the upper three grades of some 1400. One of the things that we have been quite concerned about the last couple of years, you've probably heard our superintendent speak about from time to time at Kiwanis, we have to provide for the fifty per cent of the students who do not go on to college. And this, Dick, primarily is why I'm here. We're starting vocational distributive education and we hope in the next two years to be able to cover all the vocational areas, this would include trade and industrial, agriculture, home economics, and all the areas that young people are interested in who are planning not to go to college but to go into the work force.

EMPLOYER: I see, I think that's pretty good. We obviously have a lot of college graduates in our business here, but you don't run the business, as far as a store like ours is concerned, with only college graduates.

COORDINATOR: Well, right. I think in our society we're seeing a change in this type of thinking. We're starting to be concerned and starting to value the good hard work that somewhere along the line got kind of lost. It's not only the students going to college now who are important but we're also thinking in terms of the student who is going into the work force to make a living.

EMPLOYER: Is your program primarily pointed toward retailing?

COORDINATOR: We deal with retailing, wholesaling and service type business. In other words, any student who is interested in the distribution of goods from the producer to the consumer.
EMPLOYER: And how long have you been involved in this kind of a program?

COORDINATOR: I'm completing my fifth year now. I had taught out at North High for quite some time.

EMPLOYER: I see.

COORDINATOR: My wife and I just recently moved and they are starting a new program here and I thought it would be quite an opportunity for me.

EMPLOYER: Well, I am interested a little bit in, as a matter of fact quite interested, in what your program really is because one of our biggest problems is in hiring full time employees that are going to stick with us and really know their business.

COORDINATOR: That's right. I think we've got something for you here, we're sure we have.

EMPLOYER: If you have something along those lines, I think we had better be talking a lot more.

COORDINATOR: Fine, Dick.

DISCRIMINATION TRAINING

DISCRIMINATOR: In your materials you will find some critique forms. I'd like you to look at the one marked "self-evaluation form--Skill #1--establishing rapport." In terms of the items on this critique form, Tom's skill in establishing rapport was excellent. Did you notice that when Tom met the employer he specifically said the employer's name and greeted him very cordially? Tom expresses the feeling that he is eagerly anticipating this business encounter. Within the first few moments he tells who he is, where he's from and why he is there. Let's review the model again in the introduction and see how Tom handled the first two items on the critique form.

Item #1: Did you cordially greet the employer?
Item #2: Did you properly introduce yourself?

Let's take another look at that introduction.

COORDINATOR: Good morning Mr. Weirich, my name is Tom Hephner.

EMPLOYER: Glad to know you Tom, I'm Dick.
COORDINATOR: I talked to you earlier this week about distributive education. I'm from South High School and we're starting a new program in distributive education next fall.

DISCRIMINATOR: As you have probably noticed, many of the critique items overlap. Tom's success as a coordinator depends on his simultaneous use of the various techniques which are itemized on the critique form. Tom's enthusiastic, positive behavior is definitely a part of his effort to establish interaction with the employer. Let's take another look at the model and observe how Tom combines the elements of critique items 3, 7 and 8 to show that he values Dick as a person as well as a business acquaintance.

Item #3: Did you seek to establish interaction by appealing to the employer's interests?
Item #7: Were you enthusiastic?
Item #8: Were you positive?

EMPLOYER: I certainly appreciate your phone call, I am just a little bit familiar with the school. About the phone call, it does help us a great deal here to be able to plan things in advance. Right now I'm planning a trip to Canada.

COORDINATOR: Oh, you are? Fine, where are you going?

EMPLOYER: Well, we're going up above Montreal a little bit. We're going to try out some of the fishing equipment here at the store.

COORDINATOR: That's beautiful country, beautiful.

EMPLOYER: We're really looking forward to it.

COORDINATOR: How long do you think you'll be gone?

EMPLOYER: Oh, about two weeks. It's been a long time since I've been on vacation so I'm looking forward to it.

DISCRIMINATOR: Items 4, 5 and 6 are mannerisms of speaking which can be helpful or distracting to the coordinator who is trying to establish rapport. You may wish to review the entire model for your own evaluation of Tom's success on these items. For now let's review just a part of the interview in which Tom's facial expression tells the employer that he is both listening and reacting.

EMPLOYER: I'm curious about something else too. How many students will be graduating this year?
COORDINATOR: We hope to graduate 450.

EMPLOYER: I see.

DISCRIMINATOR: You will now have an opportunity to practice establishing rapport with an employer. Following these directions, please turn this machine off and start the other machine recording. Then turn this machine back on and you will be confronted with an employer. Try to establish rapport with this employer. You may now turn this machine off.

STIMULUS TAPE (for Practicing Establishing Rapport)

EMPLOYER: Hello there (10 second pause)*

For the course of our little interview here, why don't you just call me Dick, it will make things a lot easier. I really do appreciate your calling me the other day because we have a great deal of work that needs to be done and without planning in advance it just doesn't get done. As I indicated to you on the phone, we do have a few part-time openings, but not too many. We do like to cooperate with the schools so I think we ought to talk about it some more. Now, let me see, did you say that your school was located in the southern part of the city?

(15 second pause)*

Yes, I do know where that is. As a matter of fact, I have a brother-in-law that has a small sporting goods store just a few blocks away from the school. He's the kind of guy that doesn't really go at it in a business sense, it's more of a hobby for him. But, you know sometimes we could learn things from people like that. By the way, how's your football team going to be this year?

(20 second pause)*

Yes, as a matter of fact, it was pretty much the same way when I was in school. Everything revolved around the football team. The band, the pep clubs, just about everything. And, it's pretty great too. By the way, I've been reading some things about your debate team too.

(15 second pause)*

How big will your graduating class be this year?

(15 second pause)*

*Time for response by the coordinator-in-training.
Now, of that graduating class, what percent of them is oriented to go on to college and what percent is planning to go into the work force?

(30 second pause)*

In addition to the vocational program, I guess that's the right term, the vocational program that you're talking about, do you have any other vocational programs there?

(30 second pause)*

About yourself now for just a few minutes. Tell me, how long have you been involved in this kind of work? And, have you had any retailing?

(30 second pause)*

CONCLUSION

DISCRIMINATOR: Now use a clean critique form and play back and evaluate your own response to the employer. This is the end of this tape.

Explaining the Cooperative Education Program

INTRODUCTION

DISCRIMINATOR: This second video tape illustrates the coordination skill of explaining the distributive education program to the employer. Since you will often be explaining your program to busy employers, it is very important that you explain the program in a very concise manner. This will be a plus for you. In the following model notice that Tom focuses his answers on the business employer's interests. He does not try to explain everything he knows about cooperative education to the employer. Please find your critique form for Skill #2 in your materials. After you have viewed the model, you will use this critique form to evaluate Tom's ability in explaining the program to the employer. First, let's look at the items on the critique form.

*Time for response by the coordinator-in-training.
Item #1: Deals with the relationship between classroom experiences and on-the-job training experiences.

Item #2: The main objective of this whole program is education. You should make this point clear.

Item #3: The stress in this particular case is on the fact that the employer should know what his responsibilities are to be.

Item #4: You should present your explanation in an orderly and understandable manner.

Item #5: You only have so much time to answer. Your answer should be adequate but not too long.

Item #6: If the employer gives you a whole series of questions, be sure to respond to each point.

Item #7: If the employer asks you a long and involved question, you should wait until he is completely finished before you respond.

Item #8: Give the employer only the essential information.

After you have viewed the model, you will then critique Tom's ability to explain the program to the employer. Let's take a look at the model.

MODEL (Tape depicting a Coordinator Explaining the Cooperative Education Program).

EMPLOYER: Well, Tom, tell me a little bit more about the program.

COORDINATOR: It's a cooperative program, meaning that the students attend school in the morning and study subjects relating to marketing and distribution. Some of these might be sales, advertising, display, and any area that relates to business establishments around the community where they can see a relationship between their academic instruction in school and their on-the-job learning experiences. This is what we mean by cooperative education.

EMPLOYER: In other words, they get it in the classroom in the morning and they get it in the afternoon on the firing line.

COORDINATOR: That's right and it's a cooperative venture between school and business.

EMPLOYER: If we were going with something like this, how would it really get set up?

COORDINATOR: We start in the spring with the junior students who will be seniors when they start to work for you. We select these students on the basis of career goals with each student having a definite, firm conviction that they want to earn a living in the field of distribution. We put
them through a series of in depth interviews, check their school records and then arrive at our final selection. Then these people go out and interview, in a typical interview fashion, to obtain work in the different business places around the community.

EMPLOYER: Well, how do we know what to do when that student comes to work that first day?

COORDINATOR: The student and myself and the training sponsor, the training sponsor will be the supervisor who is in charge of the student in the department, all sit down together and draw up a schedule of learning activity. We call this a training plan.

EMPLOYER: Okay, fine. There is a training plan to this program.

COORDINATOR: Yes, that's right.

EMPLOYER: Does this involve much in the way of paperwork or anything on our part?

COORDINATOR: Initially at the beginning of the year, it will involve a little bit of time on the part of the training sponsor, but we'll try to keep this to a minimum. The only other thing is that we would hope you would evaluate the student. The training sponsor should evaluate the student once every six weeks for their grade on their report card.

EMPLOYER: Okay, we have an evaluation program anyhow. Yours will be a little different, but we're familiar with evaluation. Another point, how do we have to treat these students? Do they get special treatment?

COORDINATOR: We would hope you would treat the student just like any of your other beginning employees. This is part of the program. We want them to have a typical work experience and we will guide it with the training plan, but it should be a typical working experience for them.

EMPLOYER: I see, how about money?

COORDINATOR: They should receive the beginning wage, the wage that you would pay beginning workers.

EMPLOYER: That's no problem. You said they were in their junior year now and you'd be getting them selected and they would be starting for us in the fall. Could we use them this summer for example?
COORDINATOR: Dick, this is a possibility. We don't normally encourage this because we like to see this coordination that I mentioned before between school and business. We like to more or less schedule their learning experiences. However, it's kind of an option type of thing. If you feel that you need the student in the summertime and based on our evaluation we think the student might be able to learn something by working in the summer, this might be worked out. Generally, we don't encourage this.

EMPLOYER: Okay, I guess I'll look someplace else for my summer help.

COORDINATOR: If you feel that you need them we might be able to work something out.

EMPLOYER: Tell me a little bit more about the program in terms of geography, is this program just local?

COORDINATOR: No, we have three hundred programs in Ohio now and, of course, distributive education is offered now in every state in the Union.

EMPLOYER: My goodness, I haven't been aware of the program for some reason or other.

COORDINATOR: I might add too that it's part of a total vocational effort. There are four other educational areas: trade and industrial education, agricultural education, home economics and office education.

EMPLOYER: Another question, we take these students and they work with us on a part time basis during the school year but my concern, from a business standpoint, is that I'm looking for potential full time employees. Now, are these people, I know you said they're geared toward marketing, but how many of them go off to college and then we lose this whole thing?

COORDINATOR: We do not look primarily, in fact we don't look at all, for college bound students. The program is designed for those young people planning to enter the work force after graduation. Now, very frankly Dick, we do have students who enter the program in good faith feeling that they will work in distribution upon graduation, but during the school year they change their mind and want to go on to college. We do not encourage this. Again, we try to select on the basis of a career goal in distribution, and those people who are going directly into the work force.

EMPLOYER: Well, Tom, I think you've given me quite a little picture here and I think I'm going to ask you a few more questions about it.
COORDINATOR: Good, Dick, good.

DISCRIMINATOR: Now finish critiquing Tom's explanation techniques.
Now that you have critiqued Tom's interview, video record yourself responding to the following employer and then critique your response.

**STIMULUS TAPE** (for Practice in Explaining the Cooperative Education Program)

**EMPLOYER:** I'd like just a little clarification as to what this cooperative program is. Now you mentioned having some students come in on a part time basis. Is this what you mean by a cooperative program?

(20 second pause)*

What do we have to do in terms of paperwork here in the personnel department and also, will we have to treat these students any differently than we treat our regular employees?

(20 second pause)*

What kind of money are we talking about for this job? Do you have certain salaries that you want us to pay or do we just handle it in some fashion that suits us?

(15 second pause)*

Is this program something to meet the needs just here in this city or is this something that has been expanded to the state or even national level?

(15 second pause)*

Let me back up here and ask another question about these employees. How about summer employment on a full-time basis? Do you expect this or would it be helpful in your program?

(20 second pause)*

While we're on the subject, how about another question? Are these students geared primarily to going into full-time work as soon as they graduate or are they seeking something further in the way of education? If so, what kind of opportunities exist to them to further their education? Do you have any figures on how many of the students go right into full-time employment?

*Time for the response by the coordinator-in-training.
CONCLUSION

DISCRIMINATOR: Now take a clean critique form and play back and evaluate your own response to the employer. This is the end of this tape.

Convincing the Employer

INTRODUCTION

DISCRIMINATOR: In this third video tape we will work on the skill of convincing the employer. In the following model you will see that Tom wants to convince the employer to provide a training station for his students. While some of the items in the critique form for this model are closely related to the skill of explaining the program, they provide the coordinator with an opportunity to sell his program. As Item #1 indicates, for instance, was your explanation of the coordinator's role a convincing factor, it would be easy for the coordinator to describe his program in a rather textbook manner. However, the successful coordinator views this situation as an opportunity to tell the employer that the coordinator's role is advantageous. As you look at the model, notice how Tom uses his explanations to sell his program. Let's look at the model.

MODEL (Tape depicting a Coordinator Convincing an Employer to provide a Training Station)

EMPLOYER: Tom, there are a few more questions I need to ask you to make sure I understand. Can you tell me what the real role will be between the coordinator and our operation?

COORDINATOR: My job as coordinator is to see that the student gets a good background in terms of the academic education in the morning and the on-the-job related learning experience in the afternoon. Now everything I do, Dick, pretty much centers around this basic concept. I will try to work with you and the student to see that he or she has a good experience in his program of distributive education throughout the year.
EMPLOYER: Question. I have an employee, my own employee, that's dipping into the till. I can't put up with that kind of thing, I have to take disciplinary action. Now what if that happens with one of your students?

COORDINATOR: I should hope that it would not happen, Dick. This is part of our selection process, and one of the things I look for very carefully when I screen my students at the beginning of the school year. I'm speaking of the spring now. We look for any evidence of arrest records or anything that might indicate the student might possibly be dishonest. However, if it should happen, we would expect you to dismiss that student just as you would dismiss an employee. There is one difference, I would like to point out if you don't mind. Because it is a younger person, many times working a first job, I would want very much to talk to you, and perhaps the student, before you would have to dismiss that student.

EMPLOYER: I assume that you would want that same kind of a contact even if it wasn't a money matter; for instance, if a student wasn't doing a good job for us?

COORDINATOR: Yes, anytime a student comes close to being released, I would want to talk to you before this took place.

EMPLOYER: Do we have a choice in which students we'd have to work in this program?

COORDINATOR: Yes you do, Dick. We send you three of our students and you might select one or all three to work in your place of business. If you choose not to hire any one of the three, we can send you another group. Generally, though, it's part of my job again to see that I have a pretty good idea of what your needs are.

EMPLOYER: How do the students feel about this program? I know it's new here, but you've had background in other school systems. Do they like this kind of program or not, what's their reaction to it?

COORDINATOR: Well, as you point out, it is a new program here at our school. We have had quite a bit of response from the students who'll be taking the program and in my interviews and working with them, I found them very interested and enthusiastic about the program. I think we're going to have a great year.

EMPLOYER: Have you contacted any other businesses here in the center?
COORDINATOR: Yes, I tried to contact all the businesses where I thought my students would have a good experience. This is kind of a selection process too. We like to work with the businesses who will be cooperative with us and provide good experience for our students.

EMPLOYER: Let me ask you another question. Taking off the kid gloves. We recognize our social responsibility, but we are also a business, so could you tell me as you see it, just what's in it for us?

COORDINATOR: Dick, you're talking about profit I'm sure. We would not expect you to do this out of the goodness of your heart. We feel that we have something for you that is profitable in that we can provide you with a trained, interested employee. I'm sure you recognize the fact that young workers will someday be the backbone of your business. They are your future managers and future buyers who will grow with your business, and I think essentially this is what we have to offer you. Now sure there are social obligations, if you will, and some of these other things, but from a profit standpoint we've got an interested young person who wants a career in retailing or distributive marketing.

EMPLOYER: One more question. I think you are making a good case, but are there any statistics available as to the success of this program?

COORDINATOR: In terms of follow up studies on students staying in the field; generally about fifty to sixty per cent stay. This is somewhat distorted because some students go into the service and return to distributive occupations and other gals maybe get married and come back to work on a part time basis. I'm sure you recognize the complexities of this type of study. But, we have had good results in terms of follow up with our graduates.

EMPLOYER: Tom, I think you've made a good case. What I would like to do now is to take a little time and talk with some of our department heads and supervisors to see how we might be able to use such a program. I'd like to get back to you next week on it if I could.

COORDINATOR: Fine, Dick. Without being too bold, might I suggest that you talk with some of the students? I would be very happy to send a couple over.

EMPLOYER: Well, I'll tell you what. After I get a chance here to talk with some of the department heads, it might be a good idea to do something like this, maybe with the department heads rather than myself.
COORDINATOR: Okay, fine.

EMPLOYER: Maybe we can get together on it then next week.

COORDINATOR: Good, Dick, thanks for your time.

EMPLOYER: Thank you.

DISCRIMINATION TRAINING

DISCRIMINATOR: Items 3, 4 and 5 on the critique form are similar to Item #1 in that they represent material which could be used for explanation purposes only. However, these explanations can be used as selling points if you will point out the advantages and strong elements of distributive education. Let's take another look at a portion of the model in terms of Items 3, 4 and 5 and rate Tom's ability to use explanatory material in a convincing way. Let's view that portion.

EMPLOYER: Let me ask you another question now, taking off the kid gloves. We recognize a social responsibility, but we are also a business. Could you tell me, as you see it, just what's in it for us?

COORDINATOR: Dick, you're talking about profit I'm sure. We would not expect you to do this out of the goodness of your heart. We feel that we have something for you that is profitable in that we can provide you with a trained, interested employee. I'm sure you recognize the fact that young workers will someday be the backbone of your business, they are your future managers and future buyers who will grow with your business, and I think essentially this is what we have to offer you. Now, sure there are social obligations if you will and some of these other things, but from a profit motive we've got an interested, young person who wants a career in retailing or distributive occupations.

DISCRIMINATOR: Please stop this machine now and reread the critique form items for Skill #3 to help you respond in a convincing manner to the following employer. Then proceed with the video recording of your response to that employer.
STIMULUS TAPE  (for Practice in Convincing an Employer to Provide a Training Station)

EMPLOYER:  Well, from what you've told me so far, this program sounds like it might interest us very much. You've explained it pretty well, but I do have a few more questions I'd like to ask. First one, if we go with a program of this type, could you explain to me, very specifically, what would the role of the school be? Would you be the person that would work with us here in the store?

(30 second pause)*

Another question, what would really happen if we had a student that wasn't working out for us in a satisfactory manner, say maybe a poor attendance record or a bad attitude towards the work? Would we treat them in a different fashion from our own people? Maybe with our own people we'd want to counsel them and even wind up firing them. How would it work in your program?

(20 second pause)*

I see, in other words then, you would be helping us to train these students and work with them, is that right? Are these students potential full-time employees for us would you say?

(15 second pause)*

Do we have any choice at all in the selection of the student that would come to work with us in this program? Do we have any choice in how many it might be?

(20 second pause)*

Now, I have another kind of a question for you, maybe just a little bit different. How do the students like this program? Do you have a good attitude among your students? And, also what percentage of them drop out?

(20 second pause)*

How many other businesses here in the center have you contacted for this kind of program?

(15 second pause)*

*Time for response by coordinator-in-training.
Now I've got another question for you, and that is very simply stated: What's in it for us? Forgetting about the social aspects of it and what we ought to be doing for the community, just tell me what's in it for us if we go with this program?

(30 second pause)*

One more question here before we wind it up. How successful has this program really been? Are you looking for it to expand here in this area in the near future or just how successful are you with it?

(20 second pause)*

Well, I think you have presented a very reasonable case and quite frankly I'm interested in it. I would like to explore it during the course of this following week with some of the people here at the store to see if I can get some more interest from them. I'd like to get back to you say a week from today and we'll talk over more details at that point of time. Thank you very much for coming in and explaining the program.

DISCRIMINATOR: Now use a clean critique form and play back and evaluate your response to the employee. This is the end of this tape.

*Time for response by coordinator-in-training.
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