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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Nature and Background

A basic premise of vocational education is that teachers of occupational programs should be experienced in the occupations they teach. Discussions of occupational experience and the ability to teach have consistently appeared in the literature of vocational education. Since the early twentieth century, the literature of vocational education has linked both occupational experience and teaching ability to the preparation of teachers of occupational programs.

Charles Prosser, an early vocational education leader, developed 16 principles which have served as the basis for vocational education philosophy for many years. These principles, included in Vocational Education in Democracy (Prosser and Quigley, 1949), have withstood the test of time and are still used in judging effective vocational programs. An effective program of vocational education contributes to the nation's economic welfare by training and supplying competent workers so essential to the economic and social progress of the country. Prosser's principles, as cited in Prosser and Quigley (1949), included the following:
1. The training environment is the working environment itself or a replica of the working environment.

2. The training jobs are carried on in the same way as in the occupation itself.

3. The content of the training which is taught is obtained from masters of the occupation, not theorists. (p 234-235).

Since its earliest beginnings it has been stated and implied that effective occupational instruction has required teachers who have been experienced in the occupation for which they teach. Accordingly, it has been assumed that employers will hire individuals who have been trained by teachers who possess at least the minimum skill requirements of a particular occupation. The field of vocational education has assumed that the occupationally experienced and knowledgable instructor will be able to replicate the work environment for a particular occupation and therefore prepare individuals to assume specific occupational roles in the business world.

This assumption grew out of the postulate of Prosser (1949) which stated that:

...Vocational education will be effective in proportion as the instructor has had successful experience in the application of skills and knowledge to the operations and processes he undertakes to teach. (p. 234-235)

This principle or theorem has become integral to the preparation and certification of teachers in vocational education.
That vocational teachers are both knowledgable and experienced in the occupation in which they teach underlies the assumption that they should be well qualified in choosing curriculum content of their particular program. Thus, teachers not only must be able to impart the knowledge they possess, but also must have sufficient knowledge and occupational experience from which to develop curriculum content for the particular program they teach. Therefore, their particular expertise in their occupational speciality enables them to select the most appropriate content to impart to students. This logical progression of thought regarding occupational experience of teachers is vividly underscored in a federal document that was prepared at the end of World War II, "Vocational Education in the Years Ahead," (1945), which covered possible postwar problems in vocational education. A portion of this report considered three principal requirements for teachers of programs of vocational education.

The continuity of this logic was highlighted in a special message to Congress on American Education, on February 20, 1961, by President John F. Kennedy. In his message, President Kennedy called for a review of all vocational education programs because of the dramatic sociological and technological changes that had occurred in our society in recent years and that were anticipated to occur in future decades.
In November 1962, the Panel of Consultants submitted its report, *Education for a Changing World of Work*, which became the basic framework for the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The report concluded that vocational education had been insensitive to labor market conditions and had failed to serve diverse populations. Many limitations were identified, including variations in programs and quality of offerings from state to state, inadequate guidance, lack of organized research efforts, outdated curriculum and instructional materials, and the lack of choice of occupational programs for students.

Along with an emphasis on meeting the needs of various groups of people and of changing labor market conditions, *Education for a Changing World of Work* (1962) addressed the particular issue of occupational experience as a basis for the certification of teachers of vocational education. The select Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education reaffirmed the basic premise of vocational education that teachers of occupational programs should be experienced in the occupations they teach. The report referred to occupational experience for the certification of teachers of vocational education in the section of the document which stressed teacher education as an integral part of the structure of vocational education. Occupational experience was recognized by the panel as one of the primary components for the certification of teachers of vocational education.
As a result of the 1963 Vocational Education Act, an advisory council on Vocational Education was appointed and charged with making a report in 1968. The council's report entitled "Vocational Education: The Bridge between Man and His Work." (1968), identified weaknesses in vocational education, highlighted unmet needs, and made specific recommendations for improving vocational programs.

This report stated that "the teacher of vocational education is generally competent in his field, and he knows how to teach" (p. 37). The report further discussed occupational experience, and it linked occupational experience to the requirements for certification of teachers of programs of vocational education. Thus, the Council's report reaffirmed the relationship between occupational experiences and teaching ability. The report also described occupational experience and the requirements for certification by the various service areas. Although the occupational experience and the requirements of certification differ by service area, occupational experience is understood to be an integral part of the education, preparation, and certification of teachers of programs of vocational education. The continued emphasis on the occupational experience competency of teachers was cited by Taylor and Miller in The Changing Role of Vocational Teacher Education (Evans, Editor, 1971). The authors noted the importance of occupational experience in the preparation
and certification of teachers of vocational education, including the program area of Marketing and Distributive Education (MDE).

Presently, occupational experience is a requirement for the education and certification of teachers of programs of MDE in most states. This requirement makes the preparation and certification of MDE teachers different from the preparation and certification of teachers of general education. While both teachers of MDE and teachers of general education are generally required, for example, to obtain college credit for student teaching and subject matter, teachers of MDE are additionally required to have occupational experience in the subject matter they teach.

This occupational experience requirement of teachers of MDE presents challenges in the preparation and certification of teachers. Involved are the setting of standards of occupational experience, the administration of these standards, and the assessment of the occupational experience of teachers. In meeting these challenges, no uniformity has developed among the states in setting and applying standards, although most states do have a requirement for some type of occupational experience.

Thus, the linkage between the occupational experience of MDE teachers and the curriculum content which is to be taught has carried over the years in the preparation and certification of MDE teachers.
This relationship has been the subject of several studies. The research that has been conducted has examined the relationship between occupational experience and teacher competency (Beasley (1981); Winterton (1979), Burrow (1976), and Groneman (1976)). Although the dependent variable in each of those studies was teacher effectiveness, the independent variable was occupational experience of teachers. A review of the literature did not show this variable as the subject of prior research when related to the nature of occupational experience of teachers, and therefore it appears to be a viable independent variable to investigate.

**Purpose of the Study**

Vocational programs have frequently and commonly been described as containing various "service areas." The service areas of vocational programs include the major divisions of health, home economics, business, technical, trade and industrial, agricultural, and MDE. Within the service area of MDE the importance of the occupational experience of teachers has been consistently emphasized. Since the passage of the George-Dean Act (1936), when federal money was first allocated for distributive occupations, occupational experience has been an integral part of the education and certification of teachers of programs of MDE. The emphasis upon the relationship between
experience and the education and certification of teachers of programs of MDE has been noted in public documents.

At the first National Training Conference on Distributive Education (1939), a pattern emerged that included the occupational competency of teachers of programs of MDE. Teachers of programs of MDE were to be recruited primarily from business and industry. Thus, occupational experience was established as a principal requirement of teachers of programs of MDE. This action at the first National Training Conference acknowledged and reinforced the historic premise that teachers should be experienced in the occupations they teach.

Soon after the National Training Conference, Kenneth B. Hass (1941) wrote that "only occupationally competent and experienced workers should be employed to teach the working practices of distributive occupations" (p. 250).


...as a result of his occupational experiences, the prospective teacher-coordinator should be able to understand and use the language of distribution and to interpret and analyze the data of distribution. (p. 19)
Moreover, the report further emphasized that occupational experience contributes significantly to the understanding of activities and attitudes within and about marketing by teachers of distributive education.

Specific reference to occupational experience as a component of the certification of teachers of programs of MDE was found in *Vocational Education: The Bridge between Man and His Work* (1968). Issued by the Advisory Council on Vocational Education, this report stated that:

...in distributive education, the content is often not taught in college, so the teacher learns it as an employee, usually before they begin to think about teaching as a career. (p. 37)

Burrow (1976) confirmed the relationship between occupational experience and what a teacher teaches. In his study, Burrow identified the purposes of the occupational experience requirements established for the certification of Business and MDE teachers and the teaching competencies needed by these teachers. He also noted those competencies that can be developed through occupational experience.

Burrow's analysis established 16 purposes of occupational experience in relation to teacher competency in Business and MDE.

On the other hand, the importance of occupational experience may be questioned. Dr. Edward E. Harris, a member of the Research Projects Committee of Delta Pi Epsilon, suggested that an area of needed research is the
possible relationship between occupational experience and curriculum content areas within MDE.

Similarly, since there are typically minimum standards in given states for occupational experience of MDE teachers, there are obviously great ranges of occupational experience of MDE teachers. Thus, while a teacher may be required to possess a minimum of a certain number of years or months of occupational experience in marketing occupations, there is no upper limit with regard to occupational experience. If occupational experience is an important part of teachers choosing content for which they will be responsible in the classroom, then it follows that different levels of occupational experience might be related to those curriculum content choices.

Also, since the field of MDE is very broad, it might be assumed that teachers with differing MDE occupational experiences might place different emphasis on content they choose to teach. These examples are offered to illustrate possible areas of variance in teacher selection of content as related to different prior occupational experiences in marketing occupations. The aspects of occupational experience which might relate to selection of curriculum content areas are the particular marketing industry in which the experience was acquired, the occupational level at which the experience was acquired, the extent to which that
occupational experience was in a full-time capacity, and the total length of occupational experience.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine what differences exist between the occupational experience of MDE teachers at the secondary school level and the importance those MDE teachers place upon the curriculum content areas of MDE.

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed:

1. What differences exist between the industry type in which secondary school MDE teachers obtained the majority of their occupational experience and the importance they place upon the curriculum content areas within MDE?

2. What differences exist between the occupational level in which secondary school MDE teachers obtained the majority of their occupational experience and the importance they place upon the curriculum content areas within MDE?

3. What differences exist between the extent of occupational experience of secondary school MDE teachers and the importance they place upon the curriculum content areas of MDE?
4. What correlation exists between the total amount of occupational experience of secondary school MDE teachers and the importance they place upon the curriculum content area within MDE?

**Research Design**

This study was a field investigation that used an ex post facto design. The major variables were:

1. Occupational experience of secondary school MDE teachers including the type of industry (retail or non-retail), the occupational level (entry or management), the extent of employment experience (part-time or full-time) and the total amount of occupational experience in all jobs prior to teaching. These variables were measured by a demographic profile.

2. The importance MDE teachers at the secondary school level place upon the curriculum content areas of MDE consisting of human relations, display, selling, communications, merchandising, economics and marketing, advertising, management, operations, product and service technology, and mathematics. These variables were measured by a Likert-type scaling of opinion and were based on the units, major topics, and subtopics of the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium (IDECC) curriculum content.
This study specifically involved:

1. An assessment of the occupational experience of MDE teachers at the secondary level including the type of industry (retail or non-retail), the occupational level (entry or management), the extent of employment experience (part-time or full-time) and the total amount of occupational experience in all jobs prior to teaching. These variables were measured by a demographic profile.

2. A rating of the importance MDE teachers at the secondary school level place upon the curriculum content areas of MDE consisting of human relations, display, selling, communications, merchandising, economics and marketing, advertising, management, operations, product and service technology, and mathematics by means of a Likert-type scaling of opinion.

Five concerns were addressed in the development of this study. These were:

1. The development of an instrument to collect data on the occupational experience of MDE teachers at the secondary school level.

2. The development of an instrument to measure the importance teachers of MDE at the secondary school level place upon the curriculum content areas within MDE.
3. The development and administration of a pilot study to test the clarity of the instrument to collect data on the occupational experience of teachers of MDE at the secondary school level.

4. The development of and validation by a panel of experts of an instrument to measure the importance MDE teachers at the secondary school level place upon the curriculum content areas within MDE.

5. The identification of MDE teachers at the secondary school level.

**Delimitations of the Study**

In order to facilitate the interpretation of this study, the delimitations were specified as follows:

1. The study was restricted to the specific vocational program area of MDE.

2. The population of MDE teachers at the secondary school level was delimited to the State of Ohio.

3. The population of MDE teachers at the secondary school level was further delimited to teachers of senior only cooperative MDE programs at comprehensive high schools in the State of Ohio.

4. For the purposes of this study, "importance MDE teachers at the secondary school level place upon the curriculum content areas within MDE" was confirmed by means of a Likert-type scaling of the opinion.
5. For the purposes of this study, "curriculum content areas within MDE" were developed from the units, major topics, and subtopics areas within the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium (IDECC). The basis for this is valid occupational research in marketing related occupations.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. Since the basis of the research design was limited to the opinions of identified MDE teachers at the secondary school level, the value of the results of this study were dependent upon the objectivity of the respondents.

2. The impact of the sample size and its composition should be acknowledged when generalizations are made to other populations.

3. The study was limited within the framework of its validity and reliability.

4. The study was limited with respect to the honesty of the respondents.
Definition Of Terms

Vocational Education: a program of education below college level organized to prepare learners for entrance into particular vocations; provided in schools or classes under public supervision and control as directed under the state board or local education agency. (Good, Carter V., Editor. Dictionary of Education, Third Edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co. N.Y.C. 1973. p. 645)


Distributive Education: a public vocational program designed to meet the needs of those 14 years of age or older who are preparing to enter an occupation in marketing, merchandising or management. (Good, Carter V., Editor. Dictionary of Education, Third Edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co. N.Y.C. 1973. p. 191)


**Competency:** a level when a person possesses those concepts, skills and attitudes which relate directly to the specific requirements of a particular position. (Good, Carter V., Editor. Dictionary of Education, Third Edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co. N.Y.C. 1973. p. 121)

**Definition Of Variables**

**Industry Type:** For the purpose of this study, any retail or non-retail industry in which the respondent gained his/her occupational experience.

**Occupational Level:** For the purpose of this study, any job within an industry related to marketing and/or merchandising of goods and services categorized as either entry level or management level.

**Extent Of Previous Occupational Experience:** For the purpose of this study, extent of work performed as either part-time or full-time employment in an industry related to marketing and/or merchandising of goods and services.

**Total Amount Of Occupational Experience:** The sum of all reported employment experiences by each usable case, stated in total months.

**Full-time:** For the purpose of the study, working or operating the customary number of hours in each day, week or month.

**Part-time:** For the purpose of the study, working or operating less than the usual full-time requirement, which is defined as 35 hours per week.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The intent of this study was to determine what relationship exists between the occupational experience of teachers of marketing and distributive education (MDE) at the secondary school level and the importance they place upon the curriculum content areas of MDE.

The literature reviewed and reported in this study is divided into two major categories: curriculum content development and teacher qualifications. Within these two categories the literature was subdivided into general vocational education and MDE.

Curriculum Content Development

Curriculum as defined by Hilda Taba in her book, Curriculum Development, Theory and Practice (1962),...

...is composed of certain elements usually consisting of a statement of aims and of specific objectives; an indication of some selection and organization of content; an implication or manifestation of certain patterns of learning and teaching, whether because the objectives demand them or because the content organization requires them. Finally, it includes a program of evaluation of the outcomes (p. 10).

Taba proposes a theory of curriculum development and a method of thinking about it that includes three sources of
criteria: (1) the present and future demands and requirements of culture and society, (2) information about the learning process and the nature of learners, and (3) the nature of knowledge and the specific characteristics and unique contributions of the disciplines from which the content of curriculum is derived.

It is of interest to note that Taba describes the process of curriculum development as a task requiring orderly thinking in which one should examine the order in which decisions are made and the way in which they are made to insure that all relevant considerations are brought to bear on these decisions. Taba suggests seven steps for the development of curriculum: (1) diagnosis of needs, (2) formulation of objectives, (3) selection of content, (4) organization of content, (5) selection of learning experiences, (6) organization of learning experiences, and (7) determination of what to evaluate and the methods of evaluation. (p. 12)

In their book, Reorganizing the High School Curriculum (1962), Harold B. Alberty and Elsie I. Alberty also examine the issue of curriculum development. They assert that curriculum:

...for general education should consist of shared ideals, values, understandings, and skills as they relate to preparation for citizenship in a democratic society, and should be shared by all students at a given level. (p. 201)
Alberty and Alberty classify procedures for curriculum development as follows:

I. The Acceptance of Authority Procedure
II. The Scientific or Analytical Procedure
III. The Social Functions of Living Procedure
IV. The Persistent Life Situations Procedure, and
V. The Adolescent Needs or Problems Procedure

Tanner and Tanner in their book, *Curriculum Development, Theory into Practice* (1975) discuss the purpose of curriculum for general education as being diversified, but also as being a basis that:

...enables all of the youth of all of the people to share in a common universe of discourse, understanding, and competence -- in short, to become independently thinking and socially responsible members of a free society. (p. 457)

Tanner and Tanner further discuss curriculum development within the context of the subject approach, the core approach, the activity or experience approach, and the interdisciplinary and problem-focused approach.

The common threads that seem to tie together the thinking of leaders in education regarding the issues of curriculum are (1) a sound curriculum must be responsive to both the changing needs of individuals and society and (2) that curriculum in education is based to a large extent on the philosophical concept that curriculum development as it relates to general education must result in the preparation for citizenship in a democratic society for all individuals.
General vocational education shares with general education the goal of developing the student's ability to cope intelligently with changing environmental conditions and to contribute to the improvement of these conditions. Broadly defined, according to Tanner and Tanner, "Vocational education also should enable the learner to find roots in the reality of the human community" (p. 563-564).

In discussing specialized or vocational education, Alberty and Alberty see the role of curriculum as being designed to meet the special needs, interests, talents and skills of the individual(s) that have, through a program of assessment, been determined to possess the potential for vocational training (p. 201).

Curriculum content as defined by Finch and Crunkilton (1979) in their book, *Curriculum Development in Vocational and Technical Education, Planning, Content, Implementation* has two divisions: formal education and informal education. Formal education includes education for life and for earning or living. The learning activities and experiences which constitute formal education are not only confined to specific classroom experiences, but also extended to include the entire educational spectrum of a school(s). Thus, they define curriculum for formal education as "the sum of the learning activities and experiences that a student has under the auspices or direction of the school" (p. 7).
Similarly, educators, including Alberty and Alberty, have thought of informal education:

...as being the sum total of those life experiences that a student embraces outside of the classroom which enhance both the students' education for life and for earning a living. (p. 7)

It is of interest to note that Finch and Crunkilton have incorporated the historic notions of formal and informal education into a single concept, the acceptance of which:

...implies that we must consider curriculum as encompassing general (academic) education as well as vocational and technical education. (p. 7).

Realistically, whether at the secondary or postsecondary level, the curriculum of vocational education should include all those experiences including work which are associated with preparation and earning a living.

The broad definition proposed by Finch and Crunkilton enables a consideration of not only what is offered in vocational and technical education, but also how these various learning activities and experiences relate to students' more general studies.

It is important to understand that curriculum content development in general vocational education, although appearing to be somewhat unplanned, has proceeded from and along processes developed for general education. Thus, the rationale of Finch and Crunkilton seems an appropriate base for a discussion of the major accepted approaches to curriculum development in vocational education.
The processes of curriculum development in general vocational education are both complex and intricate. This study focused on the importance marketing and distributive education (MDE) teachers place on curriculum content development with specific emphasis on the historic and current methods used to develop curriculum content. The methods utilized in curriculum development often are linked to the issue of occupational experience of MDE teachers.

The following discussion attempts to synthesize curriculum content development as but one aspect of the total area of curriculum. One of the requirements for certification of MDE teachers in most states is some degree of occupational experience in a marketing occupation in addition to formal college teacher preparation. Thus, this occupational experience might be a basis for the method(s) chosen in developing curriculum by MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE.

The philosophical approach to curriculum development as described by Finch and Crunkilton (1979) is a very subjective approach. This approach involves the development of belief statements which may evolve from various sources including textbooks, articles and speeches by leaders. It is important to understand that whatever the sources, eventually these belief statements must be analyzed and agreed upon by those who use them as a philosophical base
for curriculum development. Once a philosophical base is agreed upon and established, then the content may be identified that aligns to the philosophy.

A second approach to curriculum development discussed in Finch and Crunkilton (1979) is the introspection approach. This approach:

...involves an examination of one's own thoughts and feelings about a certain area. This process, whether used by an individual teacher or groups of teachers may include a search of prior employment and other life experiences in determining what might be most appropriate to include in curriculum content. (p. 113)

A third approach to curriculum content development in general vocational education is the DACUM (Developing a Curriculum) approach. Adams (1975) defines this approach which utilizes some of the basic ideas associated with introspection and other curriculum content development processes, as "a single sheet profile that serves as both a curriculum plan and an evaluation instrument for occupational training programs" (p. 24).

The unique aspect of the DACUM approach is the way that the curriculum content is displayed. A single sheet profile is used to present the skills of an entire occupation, thus reducing the chance of treating one element of an occupation separately from the others. The profile provides an independent specification of each of the behaviors or skills associated with competence in the occupation. Thus, behaviors are stated in a rather simple manner so that the
student can understand them and are organized in small blocks on a chart in such a manner that each can be used as an independent goal for the student. The profile also contains a rating scale that facilitates evaluation of achievement for each of the behaviors. Thus, the profile may be used as a record of achievement for both student and teacher.

The advantage of the DACUM approach is that through the involvement of both students and teachers in the process it allows for more relevant content to be identified and incorporated into a curriculum. The DACUM approach appears to differ only slightly from the trade and job analyses approaches utilized by Frylelund, 1970 and Mager and Beech, 1967. These approaches relied on the instructor to determine what should be curriculum content while the DACUM approach relies on input from students employed in actual work settings and teachers.

The functions approach as described by Clark and Meaders (1968) and cited in Finch and Crunkilton (1979) is considered a more objective approach to curriculum content development. This approach focuses on the functions of a business or industry that may be defined as:

...the operations that must be performed somewhere in the total business or industry in order for it to be successful or to continue in operation. (p. 119)

The function approach focuses on identification of content in terms of unifying characteristics across a
particular industry or business. The important aspect of this approach lies in its potential to cut across traditional teaching areas and bring together a variety of experts to develop a curriculum. Thus, it is important to recognize that the function approach has potential to link the various teaching areas into a more relevant and cohesive thrust for curriculum development.

An historic approach to curriculum content development is task or job analysis. During the mid-1960's several developments occurred that resulted in major refinements to this approach. Of particular interest was research conducted at the Personnel Research Laboratory, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, which resulted in the development of a procedural guide for conducting occupation surveys (Morsh and Archer, 1967). This guide enabled educators to develop a systematic approach to the study of the behavioral aspects of job requirements. V-TECS (Vocational-Technical Education Consortium of States) further refined this approach and found the use of it to be applicable to vocational and technical education. There are additional sources of information regarding the task analysis approach (Moss and Smith, 1971; Melching and Bowers, 1973; Giachino and Gallington, 1967; Mager and Beach, 1967; Fryklund, 1956; and Bollinger and Weaver, 1955). All of these sources approach task analysis from the standpoint of its importance as a
primary source for curriculum development in vocational education.

Curriculum Development in MDE

Historically, there has been a general consensus among the leaders in MDE that the competency areas with which MDE should concern itself within curriculum development are: (1) the social competency area, (2) the marketing competency area, (3) the product or service competency area, and (4) the basic skill competency area. Marketing and economics provide the structure supporting these four competency areas. These philosophical concepts were discussed in a paper entitled "Basis for Curricula Development" (1963) written by Mr. Edwin Nelson for the MDE Branch for a National Distributive Education Clinic which was organized in anticipation of the passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The four areas of curriculum provide for the development of curriculum offerings, at every instructional level, "Thus, the broad scope of curriculum remains the same, but the emphasis varies according to the needs of the student" (p. 39).

A further refinement of Nelson's four philosophical areas to include basic skills, social skills, economic skills, marketing skills and product or service technology skills as being interrelated to each other was developed in a model by Ely in a paper, "Distributive Education Programs, a program information publication," 1978, p. 22.
Mission and Premises

Another important contribution to building a structure for MDE curriculum development resulted from a 1980 conference when 232 participants drew up the following mission statement. (Samson, 1980):

a. Mission - The mission of MDE is to develop competent workers in and for major occupational areas within MDE, assist in the improvement of marketing techniques, and build understanding of the wide range of social and economic responsibilities which accompany the right to engage in marketing businesses in a free enterprise system ($\bar{X} = 9.0$). (p. 1)

In addition, conference participants rated six fundamental premises. The one premise relating to this study is:

5. Professional personnel in the field of MDE will have training in marketing, in marketing education and possess business experience in marketing ($\bar{X} = 9.4$). (p. 2)

It is of particular interest to note that this fundamental premise received the highest overall score by the participants at the conference indicating a continuing and recent concern that MDE teachers have some amount of prior occupational experience related to marketing prior to teaching.

Empirical Strategies for Curriculum Development

Analysis of the Crawford Approach. A Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Teacher Education (Crawford, 1967), is considered a benchmark for the discussion of curriculum development in MDE and has
The Crawford study and subsequent projects represent the contemporary direction in relation to empirical curriculum development in the field of MDE.

Seventy-six occupations, at three levels of employment, in seven different marketing industries, were analyzed in the Crawford study. Analysis was done of training requirements for the 76 occupations as a result of a series of interviews with full-time employees in each occupation as well as with their immediate supervisors. This analysis determined the critical tasks for each occupation. From the critical tasks, 983 competency statements were developed.

The resulting competencies were then grouped into nine topical areas: advertising, communications, display, human relations, mathematics, merchandising, product/services technology, operations and management, and selling. Each competency was associated with a specific occupation(s). In addition, Crawford worked under the assumption that an understanding of basic concepts and generalizations concerning marketing and economics is essential to all workers.

(Crawford, 1971, p. 5)

Task analysis and related theory had some influence on the Crawford study because a structured interview was used to identify critical job tasks.

The Crawford study is significant as it was one of the first to objectively attempt to develop a valid data base.
for use in the development of vocational education curriculum.

Of added significance in Crawford's study is her choice of job and task analysis as the basis for data collection from which a subject framework for MDE was developed. This approach to curriculum development assumes that workers already employed and their superiors were the best sources of information to determine competencies. It would follow then that the requirement that teachers of MDE have some amount of occupational experience would expose them to some of the competencies identified by Crawford and there might be a relationship between occupational experience and the importance MDE teachers place on curriculum content.

**Analysis of IDECC Approach.** Another important contribution to MDE curriculum development has resulted from the task inventory procedures of the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium (IDECC).

IDECC's overall procedures for curriculum/instructional materials development and specific strategies for task inventory and analysis are described in *Systematic Procedures for IDECC Curriculum Development* (Williams, et. al., 1978). It should be noted that The IDECC research techniques were adapted from *Performance Content for Job Training* (Ammerman, et. al., 1977).

Current IDECC procedures involve a multi-step process. First, literature is reviewed to identify career ladders,
equipment and materials and specific job tasks related to the occupational clusters under study. Next, a panel of industry representatives provides input on the findings from the literature. Panel input provides the basis for the development of task survey booklets designed for each occupational title included in the study. Then, survey booklets are administered to a nation-wide sample drawn from at least five states with a minimum of 30 employees in each occupation researched, plus an equal number of supervisors of such workers (for a minimum total number of 60 interviews per occupational title). In this step, the employees rate the extent to which each task is in fact part of their jobs. The supervisors indicate whether or not each task should indeed be carried out by workers in the job under study and recommend the most appropriate learning location or environment for training workers to perform each task.

The data resulting from the surveys are computer analyzed, including use of a two-stage task rejection/selection process. Tasks with F values reaching specified levels (according to a regression equation from the Ammerman programs) are selected for inclusion in the IDECC research base. Ultimately these tasks are incorporated in IDECC curricula, instructional materials (where related objectives are developed), training plans, and systems for evaluation.

Since IDECC began its work, its data bases have organized competencies and tasks in 10 curriculum content
areas: advertising, communications, display, human relations, management, mathematics, merchandising, operations, product/service technology, and selling. These 10 areas are the same as the original Crawford areas, except operations and management have been separated. Recently, IDECC has added an eleventh area of basic concepts in economics and marketing.

Finally, the IDECC approach, which utilizes a more scientific methodology, has gone several steps beyond the Crawford study and others in using the data for the development of curriculum materials that are available to MDE teachers in all states.

The IDECC approach was discussed in depth because the curriculum content statements used in this study were adapted from the major topic and sub-topic areas within each of the eleven units as the basis for trying to determine the importance MDE teachers place on curriculum content areas within MDE.

Analysis of the Lynch Approach

Also related to Crawford's research is a project conducted by Lynch and colleagues at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The results of this project were published in 1977 with the title, A Theoretical Framework for Instructional Programs in Distributive Education. Major purposes of this project were development of a theoretical framework for curriculum and instruction
development in MDE and creation of broad content outlines as a basis for design of instructional guides for 19 occupational clusters in MDE. Lynch, et.al., acknowledged the common acceptance of five broad curriculum content areas for MDE and indicated these areas could be traced back to Crawford's research (1967, 1969, 1975). The five major instructional areas identified by Lynch and his staff included marketing, product or service technology, social skills, basic skills, and economic principles/concepts.

The influence of task analysis in the development of objectives is evident in portions of the Lynch study.

Similar to the IDECC studies, Lynch used industry representatives to review the broad content outlines. The industry panel rated objectives for various occupations at three levels of work: entry, middle management, and manager/owner. Objectives were rated as either "critical", "important", "optional", or "not applicable". Like Crawford, Lynch, et. al., also utilized industry input. Lynch, et. al., however, used this input to increase project result validation, while Crawford used industry input for purposes of identification.

It is important to note the influence of Crawford and IDECC in Lynch's development of an approach to identify a theoretical framework for curriculum and instruction development in MDE approach. The Lynch study, like the Crawford study and the IDECC research all allude to the
importance of occupational competency for workers in MDE. It would seem to be important also that teachers of MDE possess some of the skills and competencies associated with their occupational experience in Marketing, thus forming a possible relationship between the occupational experience variables of this study and the importance MDE teachers place on curriculum content areas.

It is apparent from this review of literature related to curriculum development in MDE, that this process has been influenced to a major extent by the task inventory and task analysis approach. Thus, the processes of curriculum development in MDE are linked to the process for curriculum development in vocational education through the similar processes of task inventory and task analysis.

Teacher Qualification

General Vocational Education

Teacher qualifications, referred to as occupational experience for the purposes of this study, have been under scrutiny for a number of years. Little research is in evidence regarding the nature, purpose, or value of occupational experience to the vocational teacher.

The purpose of this section is to review several of the studies that have been completed in general vocational education linking the need for occupational experience as a pre-teaching requirement for teachers of general vocational education and its impact on teacher competency in the
classroom. A comprehensive search of the literature yielded no research that linked the occupational experience requirement of teacher certification with the importance they place on curriculum content areas within general vocational education and in particular MDE. Occupational experiences of vocational education teachers implies a knowledge of curriculum content that is to be taught. This variable has not been the subject of prior research when related to the importance vocational education teachers place on curriculum.

The relationship between occupational experience and the preparation and certification of teachers of occupational programs however, has been the subject of several studies. The studies that will be examined in this section include Beasley (1981), Winterton (1979), and Groneman (1976).

Beasley's study dealt with the relationship between occupational experience and the perceived technical competence of vocational data processing teachers in Colorado. Five specific hypotheses and seven specific purposes were developed for the study. It is of interest to note that one of the five hypotheses dealt specifically with relationship between the length of occupational experience completed by vocational programming teachers and their perceived competence in data processing. A significant positive relationship was found in testing this hypothesis.
A second hypothesis dealt with the relationship between vocational computer operations and programming teachers' attitudes toward the value of occupational experience and their perceived competence in data processing. A significant positive relationship was found.

A third hypothesis dealt with the relationship between vocational data entry, computer operation, and programming teachers' belief in the necessity of occupational experience and their perceived competence in data processing. A significant positive relationship was found.

A fourth hypothesis dealt with the relationship between length of occupational experience completed by vocational data entry and computer operations teachers and their perceived competence in data processing. Also, Beasley found a significant relationship between the source of occupational experience and the recency of occupational experiences and perceived competence by vocational data processing teachers. Further, a significant positive relationship was found between vocational data entry teachers' attitudes toward the value of occupational experience and their perceived competence in data processing.

The Beasley study is related to this study in that it explored some similar variables of occupational experience of vocational teachers. Of special interest is that Beasley looked at the variables of length of occupational
experience, and the source of occupational experience and found that there was a significant relationship between each of these variables and teachers' perception of their competence. These two variables are included in this study which explored the relationship between occupational experience of MDE teachers at the secondary school level and the importance they place on curriculum content within MDE.

Thus, the Beasley study tends to indicate that occupational experience is a variable worthy of investigation as it relates to teacher competency. The implication of Beasley's study is that occupational experience is a variable that does have a relationship to teacher competency. This study assumed that it should also be related to curriculum choices. Only in the past 20 years has the Vocational Educational community tried to examine this requirement as it relates to such variables as teacher competency.

Winterton's study (1978) dealt with occupational experience and competencies of home economics teachers in 13 states in the Western region of the United States. The purpose of the study was to determine the effect of current occupational experience requirements in developing the competencies necessary for vocational home economics teachers to instruct the total scope of occupational programs.
The major conclusions of the study were:

1. Increasing the number of occupational experience hours required does not necessarily involve the competency level of occupational home economics teachers.

2. Current state requirements for occupational experience are not as effective as they could be in preparing occupational home economics teachers.

3. Occupational experience is an important contributor to developing the competencies of food service and clothing services teachers.

4. Teachers with a larger amount of full-time experience recommend that more hours of occupational experience should be required for certification. (p. 80)

Two of the four conclusions of Winterton's study deal with variables similar to those dealt with in this study; indirectly, the variable of increasing the number of occupational experience hours and directly, the variable of full-time employment experience.

Although Winterton's study explored the relationship between the variables of occupational experience and the development of competencies for vocational home economics teachers, it again emphasizes the importance of occupational experience.

The third study that has a relationship to this study was that of Groneman (1976).

Groneman's study dealt with the issue of occupational experience in preparing vocational business and office education teachers. Specifically the study addressed two issues: the purposes of occupational experience
requirements for vocational teacher certification, and teaching competencies needed by vocational education teachers that can be developed through occupational experiences.

Groneman summarized her findings as follows:

Length of occupational experience, recency of occupational experience and the amount of teaching experience have no significant effect on the teaching competencies developed through occupational experiences; therefore, criteria for vocational certification should minimize these factors and should emphasize the development of the validated competencies listed in this study. (p. 106)

Further, her study found that business and office education state supervisors' relative agreement with teaching competencies developed through occupational experience was higher than that of teachers or teacher educators.

Groneman's study concluded that the two most important aspects of vocational teachers' jobs that have been most affected by teaching competencies developed through occupational experience are program planning, development, evaluation, and coordination.

It is of particular interest that two of the variables in the Groneman study, length of occupational experience and recency of employment experience are similar to two of the variables of occupational experience that were explored in this study.
Further, according to Groneman, these variables of recency of and length of occupational experience have no significant affect on the teachers' competencies developed through occupational experience.

Regardless of the findings, again the issue of occupational experience of vocational teachers and its relationship to other variables such as teacher competency has been raised as an area of needed research and study; thus having provided in part the rationale for this study.

Marketing and Distributive Education

There have been two recent studies in the service area of MDE which explored the issue of occupational work experience of MDE teachers. The Burrow study (1976) was designed to examine the purposes of occupational experience requirements for vocational teachers and the teaching competencies needed by vocational education teachers that can be obtained through occupational experiences.

Burrow's study differed from Groneman's in that it examined the issues of occupational experience requirements and teaching competency for teachers in distributive education. A multi-step procedure was used to identify purposes of occupational experience and validate teaching competencies. A literature review resulted in a list of purposes of occupational experience. This list was refined by a national panel of experts consisting of teacher educators and state supervisors in distributive education.
The panel reviewed and attempted to achieve consensus on the purposes of occupational experience through the use of a modified Delphi technique.

The next procedure involved validation of the teaching competencies that are developed through occupational experience. A questionnaire was developed using a series of competency statements selected from previously completed studies and a Likert-type rating scale. Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to rate each competency statement as to the value of occupational experiences in developing the competencies.

The questionnaire was mailed to a randomly selected sample of secondary and post-secondary teachers from the states of Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Minnesota. The questionnaire was also mailed to a randomly selected national sample of distributive education state supervisors and teacher educators.

The final procedure was to analyze the relationships between occupational experience and the identified purposes and competencies. The purposes identified by the Delphi panel were ranked in a hierarchy of importance. Competencies that can be developed through occupational experiences were ranked in order of importance.

Burrow concluded that:

...one's professional behavior in his occupational field sets an example for his students, enables him to become aware of the need for curricular
adjustments, and helps him improve his competencies in vocational guidance. (p. 101)

Burrow's study also concluded that:

...one's occupational experiences allows one to develop an insight into planning realistic goals which can be shared with students. Through occupational experience, one can gain competencies in teaching and discipline because one's knowledge of current procedures is obtained through practical experience. (p. 101)

Burrow's study implies that the occupational experience requirement for MDE teachers influences curriculum decisions (adjustments) and helps MDE teachers in developing a clearer understanding needed for the planning of realistic goals for students. The implication of Burrow's study would appear to be that occupational experience is an important factor as it relates to the area of curriculum development which is the thrust of this study.

A second study of importance in the service area of MDE is that of Eggland (1978). This study was limited to a sample drawn from the vocational service areas of business and MDE.

Eggland's study focused on the development and examination of alternative methods to the traditional occupational method of the development of professional vocational teacher education competencies. He developed a professional competence examination to measure the effectiveness of varying types and amounts of occupational experience in the development of vocational teacher competencies.
Eggland's study concluded that it is feasible to develop a test of occupational competence that discriminates between and among those with different amounts of occupational competence. Further, it can be concluded that a curriculum to supplant or supplement actual clock-hour occupational experience can be developed and is effective in the development of competencies in the realm of professional vocational education.

It is important to note Eggland's conclusions with respect to the area of proposed research in this study. Although Eggland concludes that a curriculum can be developed to supplement actual occupational experience, he failed to explore the impact of occupational experience as it relates to the importance placed on curriculum content. Rather he chose to relate occupational experience to teacher competency.

Summary

A review of the literature relevant to general education curriculum development and also to general vocational education curriculum development indicates similarities in rationale and philosophy for both areas. The major approaches to curriculum development in vocational education have been the philosophical and introspective approaches of Finch and Crunkilton, the behavior/skill identification approach included in DACUM, the functions approach of Clark
and Meaders, and the task or job analysis procedures
developed by Morsh and Archer and adapted by others.

Curriculum development literature specific to MDE is
based on the rationale that MDE programs should produce
students who are competent in designated marketing and
distributive areas. The Crawford, IDECC, and Lynch studies
utilized task analysis procedures, input from industry
representatives, and resulting competency information as the
basis for curriculum development.

Other studies have investigated variables similar to the
ones in this study. The fact that there has been research
done on the relatively broad subject of occupational
experience of vocational education teachers, but no specific
study on the relationship between the occupational
experience of MDE teachers and the importance they place on
curriculum content was an important factor in the
development of this study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY

Hypotheses and Rationale

This study was designed to determine whether a difference existed between occupational experience of secondary school marketing and distributive education (MDE) teachers in the State of Ohio and the importance they placed on curriculum content areas within MDE. It has been assumed by some authors that a relationship exists between previous occupational experience of vocational education teachers and the variable of teacher competency (Beasley, 1981, Winterton, 1979, Burrow, 1976, and Groneman, 1976).

Although these prior studies dealt with the variable of teacher competency, it should be noted that an integral part of teacher competency is the curriculum content which is to be taught. A review of literature indicated that this aspect of teacher competency has not been studied in prior research in vocational education. Since the curriculum content for vocational education, including MDE, is assumed to be related to the occupational experience of teachers, it appeared appropriate to investigate the relationship between the occupational experience of MDE teachers and the
importance these teachers place on the recognized curriculum content areas within the field of MDE.

Four hypotheses were developed to address the problem of this study. These hypotheses focused on the relationship between aspects of teachers' occupational experiences and the importance they place on curriculum content areas. All hypotheses were stated in the null form and were tested at the .05 level of significance. Because each variable was tested in relation to eleven curriculum content areas, it was decided to not reject an hypothesis if a majority of the eleven areas indicated no statistical significance.

Although there is historical precedent for suggesting a relationship between curriculum content choice and occupational experience of teachers of vocational education, there is no empirical research to substantiate a relationship. Thus, the hypotheses were stated in a null form. Each of the following null hypotheses was derived from the variables cited in the research questions associated with this study.

**Hypothesis I**

There is no significant difference between the industry type where the majority of occupational experience was obtained by MDE teachers and the importance they place upon the curriculum content areas within MDE.
Hypothesis II

There is no significant difference between the occupational level where the majority of occupational experience was obtained by MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE.

Hypothesis III

There is no significant difference between the extent of occupational experience of MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE.

Hypothesis IV

There is no significant correlation between the total amount of occupational experience of MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE.

Rationale for Hypotheses

The four hypotheses were developed to incorporate several dimensions of the potential differences between occupational experience and the importance teachers place on curriculum content areas. Because curriculum choices may relate to the nature of a distributive education teacher's occupational experience including the type of industry, occupational level, extent of occupational experience, and length of employment, it was significant to examine each of these variables and their possible influence on the curriculum choices of MDE teachers. An analysis of data
resulting from investigation of these variables should provide a basis for assessing differences between occupational experience of MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE.

Hypothesis I addressed the difference between the industry type where the majority of occupational experience of MDE teachers was obtained and the importance they placed on curriculum content areas within MDE. Hypothesis I assessed whether the variable of industry type, which was categorized as either retail or non-retail for this study, contributed to a greater or lesser level of importance teachers place on curriculum content areas. Examples of possibilities assessed included whether teachers who have had retail occupational experience place more or less importance on certain curriculum content areas than teachers who have had non-retail occupational experience.

Hypothesis II addressed the difference between the occupational level where the majority of occupational experience was obtained and the importance they place on curriculum content areas. Hypothesis II assessed whether the variable of occupational level, which was categorized as either entry level or management level for this study, contributed to a greater or lesser level of importance teachers placed on curriculum content areas. Examples of possibilities assessed included whether teachers who have had entry level occupational experience place more or less
importance on certain curriculum content areas than teachers who have had management level occupational experience.

Hypothesis III addressed the difference between the extent of occupational experience of MDE teachers and the importance they placed on curriculum content areas within MDE. Hypothesis III assessed whether the variable of occupational experience, which was categorized as either part-time and full-time for this study, contributed to a greater or lesser level of importance teachers place on curriculum content areas. Examples of possibilities assessed included whether teachers who have had part-time occupational experience place more or less importance on certain curriculum content areas than teachers who have had full-time occupational experience.

Hypothesis IV addressed the correlation between the sum of all reported employment experience for each usable case and the importance placed on curriculum content areas. Hypothesis IV assessed whether the variable of total prior employment experience was correlated with the importance teachers placed on certain curriculum content areas.

**Definition of Variables**

**Industry Type:** Any retail or non-retail industry in which the respondent gained his/her occupational experience.
Occupational Level: Any job within an industry related to marketing and/or merchandising of goods and services categorized as either entry level or management level.

Extent of Occupational Experience: Extent of work performed as either part-time or full-time employment in an industry related to marketing and/or merchandising of goods and services.

Total Amount of Occupational Experience: The sum of all reported employment experiences by each usable case, stated in total months.

Research Design

An ex post facto research design was used for this study. Ex post facto research is defined by Kerlinger (1973) as:

"Systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable. Inferences about relations among variables are made, without direct intervention, from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables." (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 379)

In this study, the independent variable, occupational experience, had previously occurred among the subjects. The dependent variable, importance placed on curriculum content areas within marketing and distributive education, was assessed and its relationship with occupational experience was studied.
Ex post facto research has several major weaknesses. These include: (1) The inability to manipulate independent variables, (2) the lack of power to randomize, and (3) the risk of improper interpretation. This risk of improper interpretation may be due in part to the possibility of a variety of explanations for complex events. Thus, in working without hypotheses to guide a study, it is easy to accept the first and often, most obvious interpretation of a relationship. (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 391).

In ex post facto research, the use of hypotheses aids in the validity of such studies, but there is still the fact that these studies may have capitalized on chance relations.

The value of ex post facto research, despite these weaknesses, is important in the fields of sociology, psychology and education because most research problems in these disciplines are not easily accomplished by experimental research. This study is an example of an area of research in which controlled inquiry was utilized but true experimental research would not have been feasible.

The fact that ex post facto research has several major weaknesses does not detract from its value as a legitimate method of inquiry.

However, in utilizing the ex post facto method of research, researchers must be alert not to accept ex post facto studies that do not test hypotheses, and they must be
mindful in interpreting the data from ex post facto research with great caution and care (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 392).

Instrument Development

The instrument used for assessing the industry type where occupational experience was obtained, the level of the occupational experience, the extent of occupational experience, the total amount of occupational experience, and the importance MDE teachers place on curriculum content areas was developed specifically for this study.

One questionnaire containing two parts was used in the study. MDE teachers completed both parts of the questionnaire: an occupational experience form and a Likert-type scale for evaluating the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE (See Appendix A for a facsimile of the instrument.)

Occupational Experience

The occupational experience portion of the questionnaire was composed of five areas which collected data regarding the company name (optional), type of business, job title, total number of months and years of occupational experience and percent of occupational experience that was full-time.

Evaluation of Curriculum Content Areas

The curriculum content portion of the instrument was designed to elicit ratings from marketing and distributive education teachers using a Likert-type scale to determine
the importance they place on curriculum content areas within marketing and distributive education. Five responses were possible: (5) "Most Important" to (1) "Least Important."

This part of the instrument consisted of curriculum content statements designed to elicit perceptions regarding the importance of the content areas in teaching marketing and distributive education.

The occupational research base of the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium (IDECC) was used to develop the content statements. This research base is a listing of competencies for marketing-related occupations which was derived through the use of a task analysis procedure. The competencies have been clustered (i.e., related competencies are grouped together) and sequenced in their recommended order of instruction on a computer print-out known as the Classroom Management System (CMS).

The CMS is divided into 11 instructional units which are common units of instruction in most MDE classrooms. These units are:

- Advertising
- Communications
- Display
- Economics and Marketing
- Human Relations
- Mathematics
These 11 instructional units are divided into major topics containing a series of statements which are further divided into subtopics.

The curriculum content statements, therefore, were derived from major instructional topics which are classified within the eleven instructional units. The statements were developed by examining the subtopics within each of the major topics to determine if in fact the curriculum content statements developed by the researcher encompassed and reflected as accurately as possible the content of the subtopics and thus the major topics of the eleven instructional units of instruction.

**Occupational Experience**

A pilot questionnaire was designed for refining and validating specific criteria for the industry where the majority of occupational experience was obtained, the occupational level at which the majority of experience was obtained, the extent of occupational experience, and the amount of occupational experience.
The pilot questionnaire was administered to seven distributive education teachers at three Career Centers in the Columbus, Ohio Public School System. These seven teachers were not part of the population of the study because they taught specialized MDE programs at non-comprehensive high schools. However, they were similar to the population since they had to satisfy the same criteria of occupational experience and professional requirements in marketing, merchandising or management to be certified as distributive education teachers in the State of Ohio.

The results of this pilot test indicated that those teachers had no difficulty in understanding and following the directions provided and in responding to the information requested. Thus, the researcher determined that this portion of the questionnaire was acceptable for gathering the specific data required.

Curriculum Content

A panel of experts (See Appendix B for a listing of panel members) was assembled to assist the researcher in validating the curriculum content statements. Each panel member was given a typed list of the curriculum content statements with instructions (See Appendix C for the statements) to indicate whether or not he/she agreed that the statement reflected the content of the subtopics and major topics as a distributive education teacher might perceive them to be. Each panel member was also provided
with a complete computer print-out listing the eleven units, major topics and subtopics.

The panel members made suggestions for the clarification, addition, and rewording of several of the statements. For example, in the Human Relations Unit the panel suggested the topic "Personal Professional Development" because this unit deals with skills and knowledge of group involvement for professional development. This suggestion and others recommended by the panel were accepted by the researcher and incorporated into the final instrument (See Appendix A for a facsimile of the final instrument.)

The panel made one recommendation for the inclusion of curriculum content statements that went beyond the scope of the curriculum content areas identified within IDECC. This recommendation was not accepted by the researcher for inclusion in the study.

The final instrument was constructed consisting of 54 statements. Because the content areas were originally clustered for their use in curriculum purposes, randomization was used to reduce proximity of closely related statements. A Likert-type scale using a ranking system of 5 - 1 (5 = Most Important and 1 = Least Important) was provided for each statement in the response column.
Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of 142 teachers of senior cooperative distributive education programs in comprehensive high schools in the State of Ohio. These teachers were identified from 1981-1982 records filed with the Division of Vocational Education, Department of Education, State of Ohio. Questionnaires were distributed to each teacher in the population.

Administration of the Research Instrument

Data were collected using mailed questionnaires. The mailing for each case included a cover letter and instrument, including instructions directed to the teacher. (See Appendix D for Facsimile of Cover Letter and Appendix A for Facsimile of Instrument.) Each teacher's cover letter directed him/her to complete the questionnaire and return the questionnaire in an enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope. Each questionnaire was coded so that follow-up of non-respondents would be facilitated while still maintaining confidentiality of the teacher respondents.

Ten days after the first set of questionnaires were mailed to teachers, a reminder letter along with another questionnaire was sent to non-respondents. In the letter the researcher expressed appreciation to those who had completed and returned the questionnaire and requested a quick response from those who had not yet responded (See Appendix E for a copy of the reminder letter).
Ten days after the second questionnaire was sent to non-respondents, the remaining non-respondents were contacted by telephone and encouraged to complete and return their questionnaire as soon as possible.

Organization and Analysis of the Data

The data obtained for each MDE teacher from the administration of the instrument were transferred manually to IBM Computer Cards for statistical analysis. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Sub Program PROC CORR and PROC TTEST were used to analyze the data. In addition, PROC GLM (the general linear model procedure of SAS) was used for further analysis of the data.

The information was collated according to guidelines established by the researcher for the study.

Occupational Experience

The instrument developed for the study provided the respondent the opportunity to list up to five occupational experiences prior to teaching. Because the majority of respondents listed some type of retail experience and because the remaining respondents' employment experiences included a wide variety of (non-retail) occupational experiences, none of which comprised a singularly large enough category to stand on its own merit, the decision was made to dichotomize occupational experience into retail and non-retail.
Occupational Level

The instrument developed for the study enabled the respondent to list a maximum of three job titles related to each occupational experience. Since the range of job titles was anticipated to be diverse, it was determined initially to classify the job titles into three categories: entry level, mid-management and management. However, after examination of the cases it was decided to classify the respondents into two categories, entry level and management, because the information provided was insufficient to differentiate the categories of mid-management and management. The occupational level was chosen by determining the level (entry or management) in which the majority of occupational experience was obtained.

Extent of Occupational Experience

The instrument developed for the study asked the respondent to list the years and months of occupational experience for each type of job within each employment experience and to indicate if the majority of the experience was part-time or full-time. Thirty-five hours per week was selected as a demarcation for determining if an experience was part-time or full-time. Respondents were categorized by converting years and months into total months and were placed in either a part-time or full-time category depending on where the majority of their occupational experience occurred.
Total Employment

Total employment was evaluated as an overall sum of months in all employment endeavors as reported by each respondent.

Cases were used if they contained a completed questionnaire. If there were questionnaires with no responses to one or more of the curriculum content statements, the non-response items were not entered.

From the questionnaire a raw count of frequencies on each variable and the covariate and the percentages of the specific responses to that variable and the covariate were produced. This information was used to describe the MDE teachers who participated in the study as follows:

1. **Industry Type** including whether the majority of the experience occurred in a retail or non-retail industry.

2. **Occupational Level** including whether the majority of the experience occurred at the entry or management level.

3. **Extent Of Occupational Experience** including whether the majority occurred as part-time or full-time.

4. **Total Employment** including an overall sum of the number of months in all employment endeavors as reported by each respondent.

The first three hypotheses of the study were tested using distributional analysis by two-way analysis of
variance (T Test). The Pearson Product Moment Correlation
Analysis was used to test the fourth hypothesis (total
employment experiences). Associated significant
probabilities (P-value) was used to test all four
hypotheses.

For the purposes of the study, industry type (retail or
non-retail), employment level (entry level or management),
and the extent of occupational experience (part-time or
full-time) were treated as discrete variables and total
months of employment in all reported occupational
experiences was treated as a continuous variable. Responses
to the individual curriculum content areas were treated as
discrete variables. Findings were considered at or below
the p \leq .05 or level of significance for all hypotheses.

To determine if the variables were independent of each
other, a Chi Square Test for independence of factors was
performed for each combination of the variables:
occupational experience and employment level; occupational
experience and industry type; and employment level and
industry type. In addition, an analysis of three-way
interactions of these variables with total employment as a
covariate was performed, to investigate the effects of these
variables.

Summary

This study was performed using an ex post facto research
design with four null hypotheses concerning the
relationships between the occupational experience of teachers of MDE and the importance they placed on curriculum content areas within MDE. Instruments to measure occupational experience and the importance teachers placed on curriculum content areas were developed. Next, a pilot study was conducted to assess the validity of the occupational experience portion of the questionnaire and a panel of experts was used to determine the validity of the 54 statements selected to represent curriculum content areas within MDE. Data were collected from the population on occupational experience using the Occupational Experience Questionnaire and on the importance teachers placed on curriculum content areas within MDE using a Likert-type scaling instrument developed specifically for the study. Finally, data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (SAS Package) and differences were considered significant at the $p \leq .05$ level.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the results of the study. Included are the responses to the variables identified for the study, the results of the testing of the hypotheses, discussion of additional analysis of the data, and a summary.

Responses to the Variables

Of the 142 Ohio Marketing and Distributive Education (MDE) teachers comprising the population for the study, 121 (85%) returned questionnaires. The number of usable cases, totaled 113 (80%). Among the usable cases, that with respect to industry type, the majority (61%) of the respondents obtained their occupational experience in retailing industries. With respect to employment level, the majority (62%) of the respondents obtained their occupational experience in entry level jobs. With respect to extent of employment, the majority (66%) of the respondents obtained their occupational experience in jobs where they worked as full-time employees. Displayed in Table 1 are the percentages of respondents in usable cases classified according to each of the variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Respondents (N)</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry Type</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailing</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Retailing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Level</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above are the number and percentages of the usable cases of the study by industry type (retail and non-retail). It may be noted that there was a wide range (19) of different industry types within the non-retail category of which six were reported by more than one respondent and the remaining 13 had only one respondent. Of additional interest is that 17 (39%) of the non-retail respondents were in the areas of Food Service and Food Marketing.
A Summary of the respondents of the study classified by industry type is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Retail</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Summary of respondents classified in non-retail industries is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Marketing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following had one respondent: Banking, Physician/Hospital Supply, Wholesaling, Mail Order, Employment Agency, Wholesale Florist, Manufacture/Wholesale, Lawn Care, Travel/Insurance, U.S. Government, Warehouse, Industrial Sales, Service (National Farmers Union).

In addition to the industry where teachers had obtained their employment experience, respondents were asked to indicate job titles which they held. Although the information was obtained in order to classify respondents by level of employment, it may be of interest to note several of the actual job titles held by MDE teachers. The
following list is a sample showing the diversity of job
titles reported.

1. Sales Person
2. Stock Person
3. Cashier
4. Waitress
5. Order Puller
6. Packer
7. Delivery Person
8. Outside Maintenance
9. Receptionist
10. Trainee
11. Bus Boy
12. Crew Chief
13. Counter Person
14. Bookkeeper
15. Gas Station Attendant

A further refinement of the profile of the MDE teacher
respondents concerning their occupational experience is
contained in Table 2.

Section I of Table 2 indicates that part-time
respondents had gained the majority of their occupational
experience (34 out of 38 respondents) in entry level
positions while those respondents reporting the majority of
their occupational experience as full-time were fairly
evenly distributed between entry and management levels of
employment.

Section II of Table 2 shows that the majority of part-
time respondents (27 out of 38 respondents) reported their
occupational experience in the retail category while full-
time respondents reported a fairly even distribution between
retail and non-retail levels of employment.
TABLE 2
COMPARISONS OF THE VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Occupational Experience x Employment Level</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>34 (30.1%)</td>
<td>4 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>36 (31.9%)</td>
<td>39 (34.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Occupational Experience x Industry Type</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Non-Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>27 (23.9%)</td>
<td>11 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>42 (37.2%)</td>
<td>33 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Employment Level x Industry Type</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Non-Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>51 (45.1%)</td>
<td>19 (16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>18 (15.9%)</td>
<td>25 (22.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III of Table 2 indicates that respondents reporting the majority of their occupational experience in entry level were predominately (51 out of 70 respondents) in the retail category while respondents with the majority of their occupational experience in management were fairly evenly distributed among retail and non-retail industries.
Table 3 indicates that among part-time respondents reporting the majority of their occupational experience as being entry level, this experience was gained in predominately (25 out of 34 respondents) retail industries, while those reporting the majority of their occupational experience as management level were evenly distributed among retail and non-retail industries.

### TABLE 3

**FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES FOR THE LEVELS OF OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE, COMPARED TO OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL AND INDUSTRY TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Experience</th>
<th>Industry Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Non-Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Level</td>
<td>25 (65.8%)</td>
<td>9 (23.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Level</td>
<td>2 (5.3%)</td>
<td>2 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Level</td>
<td>26 (34.7%)</td>
<td>10 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Level</td>
<td>16 (21.3%)</td>
<td>23 (30.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the entry level of employment experience contains a considerable majority (34 out of 38 respondents) of the part-time respondents. It should be noted that among
part-time respondents, those classified as having a retail experience background had that experience predominately (25 out of 27) in entry level positions. Similarly, it should be noted that among respondents classified as having a part-time occupational experience in non-retail, this experience was also predominately (9 out of 11) in entry level positions.

Table 3 shows that among full-time respondents almost three times as many (26 out of 36 respondents) of those reporting entry level experience reported the majority of that experience as retail, while those reporting management experience gained this experience in predominately (23 out of 39 respondents) non-retail industries.

Among respondents reporting the majority of their occupational experience in full-time retail positions, the majority (26 out of 42) gained this experience in entry level positions. Among respondents reporting the majority of their occupational experience in full-time non-retail positions, the majority (23 out of 33) gained this experience in management level positions. In summary, the retail level of industry type contains a majority (42 out of 75) of the full-time respondents.

Curriculum Content Areas

The second part of the instrument consisted of curriculum content statements designed to elicit perceptions regarding the importance of the content areas in teaching
marketing and distributive education. To develop the content statements the occupational research base of the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium (IDECC) was chosen. This research base is related to jobs for which students are being trained and jobs in which teachers may have gained their occupational experience. Furthermore, the occupational research of IDECC has resulted in a classification of curriculum into eleven instructional units which were chosen to be analyzed in relation to the variables under study.

The curriculum content statements were derived from major topics which are contained within the eleven instructional units. The statements were developed by examining the subtopics within each of the major topics to determine if, in fact, the curriculum content statements developed by the researcher encompassed and reflected, as accurately as possible, the content of the subtopics and thus the major topics of the eleven units of instruction. A Likert-type scale using a ranking system of 5 - 1 (5 = Most Important and 1 = Least Important) was provided for each statement in the response column of the questionnaire.

A mean value for the responses to the individual statements was calculated within each curriculum content area and this value was used in the testing of the hypotheses.
The arithmetic mean of these values and their standard deviation are shown in Table 4 for each curriculum content area. The range of values in each curriculum content area is indicated by the minimum and maximum values also presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Content Area</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Relations</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Display</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Selling</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Merchandising</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Economics and Marketing</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Advertising</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Management</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Operations</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Product &amp; Service Technology</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mathematics</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard deviation reveals the variance from the mean of the curriculum content statements. With respect to
curriculum content area of Human Relations, the range was minimum and maximum values. It is of importance that in all the curriculum content areas except Management and Operations at least one respondent rated all the statements as Most Important while in the curriculum content area of Display at least one respondent rated all the curriculum content statements as Least Important. It may be noted that in the curriculum content area of Human Relations, the range was narrow (2.75 -5.00). This shows that at least one respondent answered all of the statements referring to human relations except one, at the mid-range of the questionnaire (3). The one statement not rated 3 was rated a 2 on the Likert-type scale. All the other respondents answered with at least a 3 on the four statements comprising the human relations statement with a 5 (Most Important).

Table 4 reveals that in the area of Selling, at least one respondent rated 2 of the curriculum content statements with 3's (mid-range) and 2 of the 4 statements with 2's (lower range). The narrow range for this curriculum area (2.50 - 5.00) is explained by the fact that at least one respondent rated the four selling statements with a 5 (most important).

The curriculum content area of display had the widest range (1.00 - 5.00) signifying that at least one respondent rated all the statements of display as least important and at least one respondent rated all the statements of display
as most important. Additionally, advertising had a wide range (1.25 - 5.00) because at least one respondent answered 3 of the 4 statements in this curriculum area with a 1 (least important) and the fourth statement with a 2. At least one respondent rated all the statements of advertising with 5's (most important) and the remaining respondents answered two of the statements with 2's.

Results of Testing the Hypotheses

Hypothesis I

Differences between industry type where the majority of occupational experience was obtained by MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content within MDE. Responses to the industry type and curriculum content variables are presented in Table 5.

The first hypothesis tested whether there was a significant difference between the type of industry where the majority of occupational experience was obtained by MDE teachers and the importance placed on the curriculum content areas within MDE. A comparison of the curriculum content area ratings by MDE teachers classified according to the majority of their occupational experience having been in either retailing or non-retailing is presented in Table 5.

None of the curriculum content areas demonstrated a statistically significant difference in mean responses between individuals with retail or non-retail occupational
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Content Area</th>
<th>Retail Mean</th>
<th>Retail SD</th>
<th>Non-Retail Mean</th>
<th>Non-Retail SD</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Marketing</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product &amp; Service Technology</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experience. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject Hypothesis I at the p \leq .05 level.

As may be noted in Table 5 the sample mean for non-retail respondents is greater than the sample mean for retail respondents in all of the curriculum content areas except selling, advertising, and mathematics. This finding substantiates that, on the average, non-retail respondents place greater importance on all the curriculum content areas except selling, advertising, and mathematics than did retail respondents.

**Hypothesis II**

Differences between occupational level where the majority of occupational experience was obtained by MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content. Responses to the occupational level and curriculum content variables are presented in Table 6.

The second hypothesis tested whether there was a significant difference between occupational level where the majority of occupational experience of MDE teachers was obtained and the importance placed on the curriculum content areas within MDE. The comparison of the curriculum content areas by MDE teachers classified by entry and management levels of employment experience is presented in Table 6.

None of the curriculum content areas demonstrated a statistically significant difference between the mean
### Table 6

Descriptive and Test Statistics for the Occupational Level Where the Majority of Occupational Experience Was Obtained by MDE Teachers and the Importance They Placed on Curriculum Content Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entry Mean</th>
<th>Entry SD</th>
<th>Management Mean</th>
<th>Management SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product &amp; Service</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
response for entry and management level employment. Thus, the researcher failed to reject Hypothesis II of \( p \leq 0.05 \).

In Table 6 the sample mean for entry level respondents is seen to be greater than the sample mean for management level respondents in all of the curriculum content areas except human relations and display. A conclusion drawn from this finding is, that on the average, entry level respondents place greater importance on all the curriculum content areas except human relations and display than did management level respondents.

**Hypothesis III**

**Difference between extent of occupational experience of MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content within MDE.** Responses to the extent of occupational experience and curriculum content variables are presented in Table 7.

The third hypothesis tested whether there was a significant difference between the extent of occupational experience of MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE. The comparison of the curriculum content area ratings by MDE teachers as related to their occupational experience is presented in Table 7. There were three curriculum content areas in which statistically significant \( (p \leq 0.05) \) differences were detected: Selling, \( (p \leq 0.01) \), Economics and Marketing \( (p \leq 0.02) \), and Management \( (p \leq 0.03) \). Respondents with the
TABLE 7

DESCRIPTIVE AND TEST STATISTICS FOR EXTENT OF OCCUPATIONAL
EXPERIENCE OF MDE TEACHERS AND THE IMPORTANCE THEY
PLACE ON CURRICULUM CONTENT AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th></th>
<th>T  Value</th>
<th>P   Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>111 -1.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>111 -1.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>111 -2.53</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>111 -1.72</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>111 -1.60</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Marketing</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>99 -2.37</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>111 0.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>111 -2.14</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>111 -0.09</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product &amp; Service</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>111 -1.03</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>111 -0.37</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01
majority of their occupational experience in full-time jobs rated these areas as more important than did those respondents who had part-time job experience.

Hypothesis III was rejected in the three curriculum content areas referred to above. However, in eight of the eleven curriculum content areas the researcher could not reject Hypothesis III. Based on these findings, the researcher failed to reject Hypothesis III.

It also may be noted in Table 7 that the sample mean for full-time respondents is greater than the sample mean for part-time respondents in all the curriculum content areas except advertising. The importance of this is that, on the average, full-time respondents placed greater importance on all the curriculum content areas except advertising than did part-time respondents.

**Hypothesis IV**

Correlation between total amount of all employment experience reported by each MDE teacher and the importance placed on curriculum content. Responses to the total employment covariate and the curriculum content variables are presented in Table 8.

The fourth hypothesis tested for the presence of a correlation between the total amount of prior occupational experience of MDE teachers and the importance they place on the curriculum content areas within MDE. The correlation
TABLE 8
CORRELATIONAL AND SIGNIFICANCE VALUES FOR TOTAL AMOUNT OF
ALL OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE REPORTED BY EACH MDE TEACHER
AND THE IMPORTANCE THEY PLACE ON CURRICULUM CONTENT AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient (r_s)</th>
<th>P-Value Associated with Test of Ho: r_n = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Employment Correlation Coefficient (r_s)</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>For Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandising</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Marketing</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product &amp; Service Technology</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficient of total employment with the curriculum content areas by MDE teachers is presented in Table 8.

None of the curriculum content areas demonstrated a statistically significant correlation with total employment.
time. Thus, the researcher failed to reject Hypothesis IV at \( p \leq .05 \) level.

Table 8 shows that in the curriculum content areas of communication, economics and marketing, operations, product and service technology, and mathematics, there was a negative correlation with total employment, for the sample. Consequently, with an increase in the amount for total employment experience there is a decrease in the importance placed on those curriculum content areas by the sample respondents, on the average. For the other curriculum content areas which include human relations, display, selling, merchandising, advertising, and management, there was a slight positive correlation with total employment, for the sample. This indicates that with an increase in the amount of total employment there is an increase in the importance placed on those curriculum content areas by the sample respondents, on the average.

**Additional Analysis of Data**

**Test for Independence of Variables**

To determine if the variables were independent of each other, a Chi Square Test for independence of factors was performed for each combination of the variables. These tests, as indicated in Table 9, revealed that occupational experience and employment level are not independent (\( p \leq \)
TABLE 9
TEST FOR INDEPENDENCE OF THE VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ho:</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Experience And Employment Level Are Independent.</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Level And Industry Type Are Independent.</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Experience And Industry Type Are Independent.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.0001) and that employment level and industry type are not independent ($p \leq .001$).

Therefore, to determine if there were statistically significant effects of industry type, employment level, and occupational experience and interactions between the three variables considering total employment as a covariate, the data were analyzed using SAS (Statistical Analysis System) using the general linear model procedure (PROC GLM).

The GLM procedure uses the principle of least squares to fit linear models. For this study GLM was used to perform univariate analyses, (T Test, F Test) and multiple linear regression (Full Model to Data) (SAS User's Guide 1979 Edition).
The full model with two and three way interactions, as parameters was used to find those variables which were responsible for the variation in responses. The full model appears in Appendix F. Since such a small amount of the variability was explained by the full model, subsequent analysis was unnecessary. (Additional analysis was performed and all other models explained less of the variability than the full model and are therefore not useful.)

In each of the curriculum content areas no more than 16 percent of the variability in responses was explained by the variables and covariate.

For the curriculum content area of selling, the Full Model explained approximately 16% of the variability of the data in the responses. Using Type IV Sum of Squares each parameter was tested in the presence of the Full Model to determine if it was statistically significant. Only occupational experience and employment level were statistically significantly different from zero.

For the curriculum content area of merchandising the Full Model explained 15.68% of the variability of the data in the responses. Using Type IV Sum of Squares each parameter was tested in the presence of the Full Model to determine if it was statistically significant. Only occupational experience, employment level, and the
interaction of the two were statistically significant from zero.

For the curriculum content area of display the full model explained approximately 14% of the variability of the data in the responses. Using Type IV Sum of Squares, each parameter was tested in the presence of the full model to determine if it was statistically significant. Only employment level and industry type were statistically significant from zero.

The remaining eight curriculum content areas were tested in the presence of the full model. An F-Test was performed to test the Hypothesis that the parameters are all equal to zero, and the P-Values were not statistically significant. Thus, in eight of the curriculum content areas the variables and their interactions do not explain the variability in the data.

The most variability that was explained was 16% among the eleven curriculum content areas with the majority of the curriculum content areas (8 out of 11) not showing any of the parameters being different from zero.

**Summary**

There were 113 usable cases for data analyses representing an 80 percent return. Of the selected MDE teachers in Ohio, most had obtained the majority of their occupational experience prior to teaching as full-time employees, in entry level jobs, and in retail industries.
Testing of the hypotheses relating occupational experience in retail and non-retail industries and in entry level and management level jobs and the importance placed on curriculum content areas demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference for the mean response for retail and non-retail jobs and for entry and management level employment. Thus, the researcher failed to reject Hypotheses I and II.

In testing the hypothesis relative to occupational experience (part-time and full-time) and the importance placed on curriculum content area, there were three areas in which a statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) difference in the means of the importance placed on curriculum content areas was detected. The mean was greater for those respondents with the majority of their work status in full-time jobs. Because in eight of the curriculum content areas, Hypothesis III was not rejected, the researcher failed to reject Hypothesis III.

The fourth hypothesis tested the existence of a correlation between the sum total of all employment experiences reported by each usable case and the importance placed on curriculum content areas. None of the curriculum content areas demonstrated a statistically significant correlation with the covariate total employment.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This chapter presents a summary of the research problem. The procedures and findings, the conclusions, and recommendations. The implications of the findings and conclusions of the study are also presented in this chapter. This study will be of interest to the Marketing and Distributive Education community because occupational experience, as a requirement for teaching, has historically been considered important in Marketing and Distributive Education (MDE).

Background of the Problem

A basic premise of vocational education is that teachers of occupational programs should be experienced in the content of the occupation they teach. Discussions of occupational experience and the ability to teach have consistently appeared in the literature of vocational education. Charles Prosser, an early vocational education leader, developed sixteen principles which have served as the basis for vocational education philosophy for many years. One of these principles postulated that:
Vocational education will be effective in proportion as the instructor has had successful experience in the application of skills and knowledge to the operations and processes he undertakes to teach. (p. 234-235)

In 1971 Robert E. Taylor and Aaron J. Miller in a book entitled The Changing Role of Vocational Teacher Education (p. 122), cited the importance of occupational experience to the education, preparation, and certification of teachers of programs of vocational education including teachers of programs of Marketing and Distributive Education.

Statement of the Problem

Since occupational experience has been and still is an important requirement for MDE teacher certification, it should be significant to the profession to determine what differences exist between the occupational experience of MDE teachers at the secondary school level and the importance they place upon the curriculum content areas within MDE. To reach such a determination was the purpose of this study.

This research study was completed using an ex post facto research design. Four null hypotheses were developed and investigated concerning the differences between occupational experiences of MDE teachers at the secondary school level in Ohio and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE. The rationale for development of the hypotheses was to incorporate several dimensions of the potential differences between occupational experience and the importance teachers place on curriculum content areas.
Because curriculum choices may relate to the nature of a MDE teacher's occupational experience including the industry type, occupational level, extent of employment, and total amount of employment, it was significant to examine each of these variables and their possible influence on the curriculum choices of MDE teachers. An analysis of data resulting from investigation of these variables should provide a basis for assessing differences between occupational experience of MDE teachers and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE. Specifically, the following hypotheses were investigated:

1. There is no significant difference between the type of industry where the majority of occupational experience was obtained by MDE teachers and the importance they place upon the curriculum content areas within MDE.

2. There is no significant difference between the occupational level where the majority of occupational experience of MDE teachers was obtained and the importance they place upon the curriculum content areas within MDE.

3. There is no significant difference between the extent of occupational experience of MDE teachers and the importance they place upon curriculum content areas of MDE.
 Procedures

The following procedures were implemented:

Identification of the population. The population for this study was composed of 142 teachers of senior cooperative general distributive education programs in comprehensive high schools in the State of Ohio. These teachers were identified from 1981-1982 records filed with the Division of Vocational Education, Department of Education, State of Ohio.

Questionnaire development. One questionnaire, containing two parts, was used in the study and was distributed to each teacher in the population. The Occupational Experience portion of the questionnaire (Appendix A) was constructed to solicit data regarding aspects of occupational experience: company name (optional), type of business at which employed (maximum of five), job titles for each type of business experience (maximum of three), total number of months and years in each job title, and percentage of occupational experience that
was part-time and/or full-time for each job title in each employment experience.

Data collection. Data were collected using mailed questionnaires. The mailing for each case included a cover letter (Appendix D) and the instrument. Each teacher's cover letter directed him/her to complete the questionnaire and return the questionnaire in an enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope. Each questionnaire was coded so that follow-up of non-respondents would be facilitated while still maintaining confidentiality of the respondents. Ten days after the questionnaire was mailed to teachers, a reminder letter (Appendix E) was sent to non-respondents with another questionnaire. Ten days after the second questionnaire was sent to non-respondents, the remaining non-respondents were contacted by telephone. From the population of 142 MDE teachers selected for the study, 121 (85%) returned questionnaires. The number of usable cases for the study was 113 (80%).

Data analysis. All data were transferred to computer cards by The Ohio State University Statistics Laboratory and analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Relationships and differences were considered significant at the \( p < 0.05 \) level. The first three hypotheses of the study were tested using distributional analysis by two-way analysis of variance (T-Test). The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis was used to test the fourth hypothesis
(total employment experience). Associated significant probabilities (P-value) was used to test all four hypotheses.

To determine if the variables were independent of each other, a Chi Square Test for independence of factors was performed for each combination of the variables: occupational experience and employment level, occupational experience and industry type, and employment level and industry type. In addition, an analysis of three-way interactions of these variables with total employment as a covariate was performed to investigate the effects of these variables.

The Curriculum Content portion of the questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed to elicit ratings from MDE teachers using a Likert-type scale to determine the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE. Five responses were possible: (5) Most Important to (1) Least Important. The eleven curriculum content areas used were:

1. Human Relations
2. Display
3. Selling
4. Communications
5. Merchandising
6. Economics and Marketing
7. Advertising
8. Management
9. Operations
10. Product and Service Technology
11. Mathematics
Profile of Respondents

Of the 142 Ohio Marketing and Distributive Education (MDE) teachers comprising the population for the study, 121 (85%) returned questionnaires. The number of usable cases totaled 113 (80%). Among the usable cases, with respect to industry type, the majority (61%) of the respondents obtained their occupational experience in retailing industries. With respect to employment level, the majority (62%) of the respondents obtained their occupational experience in entry level jobs. With respect to occupational experience, the majority (66%) of the respondents obtained their occupational experience in jobs where they worked as full-time employees.

Findings of the Study

The predominant findings of a well organized research study should be relevant to the study's initial research questions and subsequent hypotheses. The research questions developed for this study were:

1. What differences exist between the industry type in which secondary school MDE teachers obtained the majority of their occupational experience and the importance they place on certain curriculum content areas within MDE?

2. What differences exist between the occupational level in which secondary school MDE teachers obtained the majority of their occupational
experience and the importance they place on certain curriculum content areas within MDE?

3. What differences exist between the extent of occupational experience of secondary school MDE teachers and the importance they place upon certain curriculum content areas within MDE?

4. What relationship exists between the total amount of occupational experience of secondary school MDE teachers and the importance they place on certain curriculum content areas within MDE?

These four research questions provided the basis for development of the four hypotheses. In the first and second hypothesis (industry type and occupational level and importance placed on curriculum content areas) none of the curriculum content areas demonstrated a statistically significant difference between the mean responses for each level of the variables. Thus, Hypotheses I and II were not rejected at the .05 significance level.

In the third hypothesis (extent of occupational experience and the importance placed on curriculum content areas) a statistically significant (p \leq .05) difference in the means of the importance placed on curriculum content areas was detected. The three areas were: Selling, Economics and Marketing, and Management. The mean was greater for those respondents with the majority of their occupational experience in full-time jobs in all three
areas. By virtue of the fact that \( H_1 \) was not rejected for 8 of the 11 areas, it was decided to not reject Hypothesis III.

Hypothesis four addressed the correlation between the total length of all employment experience reported by each usable case and the importance placed on curriculum content areas. None of the curriculum content areas demonstrated a statistically significant correlation with total employment; therefore Hypothesis IV was not rejected at the \( (p \leq .05) \) significance level.

**Conclusions**

The conclusions that follow are based on the findings of this study:

1. The rationale that there would be a relationship between the occupational experience of MDE teachers, as explained by the type of industry where they gained the majority of their occupational experience and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE, caused the researcher to suspect that such a relationship would be positive. However, the findings of the study indicate no positive relationship between occupational experience (industry type) and importance placed on curriculum content.

2. The rationale that there would be a relationship between the occupational experience of MDE teachers,
as explained by the occupational level in which the majority of occupational experience was obtained and the importance placed on curriculum content areas, caused the researcher to suspect that such a relationship would be positive. The findings of the study indicated that there was no overall positive relationship between these two variables.

3. The rationale that there would be a relationship between the occupational experience of MDE teachers, as explained by the extent of this experience and the importance they placed on curriculum content areas within MDE, caused the researcher to suspect that such a relationship would be positive. The findings of the study indicated no overall positive relationship between these two variables.

4. The rationale that there would be a relationship between the occupational experience of MDE teachers, as explained by the total amount of occupational experience of each usable case and the importance they place on curriculum content areas within MDE, caused the researcher to suspect that such a relationship would be positive. The findings of the study indicated no overall positive relationship between these variables.

5. Because of the diversity of occupational experiences of secondary school MDE teachers, no typical profile
of an MDE teacher could be drawn from the findings of the study.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. A study should be conducted to identify additional variables associated with occupational experience and to relate these to curriculum choice. Such variables could include size of firm in which employment occurred, and recency of occupational experience.

2. A study should be conducted utilizing other research designs to manipulate the data collected for this study. In other words, different decisions could be made concerning the occupational experience variables, such as using only the last employment experience as the determining factor for retail-non-retail categorization and level of employment.

3. The study should be replicated using a regional or national sample in order to increase the cell sizes of some of the occupational experience. This would permit a more discriminating analysis of types of experience and occupational levels.

4. A study should be conducted using another measure of curriculum choice. For example, a case study approach could be used in which the variable of
curriculum choice was measured by examination of teachers' courses of study.

5. A study should be undertaken in which teachers' actual job knowledge was measured through some type of cognitive device and this information compared to their occupational experience.

6. A study should be conducted to identify other variables in teachers' life experiences that might contribute to the importance placed on curriculum content areas so that conclusions can be drawn as to specific life experiences, of which occupation is only one. Thus, these variables could be identified and studied further.
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APPENDIX A

FACSIMILE OF OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE AND CURRICULUM CONTENT QUESTIONNAIRE MAILED TO EACH MDE TEACHER IN THE POPULATION
## OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE

### Instructions

Please complete this questionnaire in the following manner:

1. Start with most recent non-teaching occupational experience first.
2. List only those companies and jobs that relate to marketing, merchandising, and management.
3. Use a separate block for each company.
4. Use a separate line for each job title.
5. Give the number of years and/or months and % of full-time work for each job title.
6. If you wish, please add comments in the Comments column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name (optional)</th>
<th>Type of Business</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Check If over 50% work was full time*</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stock Person</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarus</td>
<td>Retailing</td>
<td>Sales Person</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ass. Buyer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the purposes of this study full-time work is any job title in which you worked more than 35 hours per week.*
## CURRICULUM CONTENT FOR MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

### INSTRUCTIONS:

The following statements are representative of curriculum content areas of a general one-year cooperative marketing and distributive education program. Please place a checkmark (✓) in the appropriate column to indicate the importance you place on each statement, in your curriculum, ranging from most important to least important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human relations in personal development</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Least Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning displays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written skills in communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations of buying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses of display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal skills in communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional planning in advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products and prices as a part of economics and marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store location and facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses of display fixtures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs as a display technique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense and control decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting and record-keeping decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing goods and services as related to economics and marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale and motivation by management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising methods and media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General office procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product knowledge related to specialized marketing occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel employment practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management policies and organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal business communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance and purposes of selling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National economy as it relates to economics and marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective customer contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise information related to selling</td>
<td>Most Important</td>
<td>Least Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics in cashiering procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving and stock handling policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and maintenance of displays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing as related to merchandising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized labor as it relates to economics and marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of product and service information for specialized marketing industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and accident prevention policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics for job success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles and techniques of display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discounts and miscellaneous charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics relating to pricing, profit and inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store maintenance and housekeeping policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics in billing procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing as related to competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational opportunities related to specialized marketing industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping and transportation policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of selling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic skills in mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposes and types of advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock considerations related to merchandising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of product and service information for specialized marketing industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

LIST OF PANEL OF EXPERTS USED TO VALIDATE CURRICULUM CONTENT STATEMENTS
Cathy Ashmore - National Center for Research in Vocational Education

Debbie Cobb Popo - Instruction Materials Laboratory The Ohio State University

Roy Young - MDE Teacher-Coordination Southwestern City Schools

Daniel Spillman - Ph.D. Candidate The Ohio State University
APPENDIX C

FACSIMILE OF INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO PANEL OF EXPERTS AND STATEMENTS
A. Statements developed should generally reflect subtopic areas.

B. Gave each panel member a copy of instrument and explained three columns.

C. Gave each panel member a copy of IDECC Curriculum statements to use as a guide to assess whether the statements the researcher had developed reflected as accurately as possible the IDECC Curriculum statements and that they would be understood by the average MDE teacher.

D. Shared problem statements of study.

E. Briefly explained IDECC to panel of experts.
APPENDIX D

FACSIMILE OF INITIAL COVER LETTER SENT TO POPULATION
May 5, 1982

Dear:

As part of my doctoral research study at The Ohio State University, I have developed the enclosed questionnaire. You have been identified as a qualified candidate to participate in my study as an Ohio distributive education teacher-coordinator in a comprehensive high school. Would you please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it at your earliest convenience in the enclosed, stamped, return-addressed envelope?

A portion of my study will include background areas of distributive education teacher-coordinators and selected curriculum areas. Please answer the questions as completely and accurately as you can. Information gathered will be used for research purposes only and, to ensure complete anonymity, code numbers will be assigned to each questionnaire.

Your assistance and cooperation in this study will be sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

David C. Jones, Graduate Teaching Assistant
Distributive Education

DCJ/bj

Enc.
APPENDIX E

FACSIMILE OF REMINDER LETTER SENT TO NON-RESPONDENTS
Dear :

Please help! I have not received the work experience/curriculum content questionnaire I mailed to you on May 3. If you have returned your questionnaire, thank you for your assistance and cooperation. I will be looking for it in the mail. If you have not returned your questionnaire, please take the short time necessary to complete and return the instrument, as each is of particular significance to my study.

The information gathered will be used for research purposes only and, to ensure complete anonymity of respondents, code numbers are assigned for follow-up-purposes only. In case you did not receive the original questionnaire, I have included another one, along with a stamped, return-addressed envelope.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

David C. Jones
APPENDIX F

FULL MODEL TO DATA (MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION)
FULL MODEL DEFINED

\[ y = \mu + \alpha + \beta + \sigma + (\alpha \beta) + (\alpha \sigma) + (\beta \sigma) + (\alpha \beta \sigma) + \eta + \xi \]

where

\( \mu \) = Overall mean

\( \alpha \) = Effect due to levels of occupational experience

\( \beta \) = Effect due to levels of employment

\( \sigma \) = Effect due to levels of industry type

\( \alpha \beta \) = Effect due to the interaction among the levels of occupational experience and employment level

\( \alpha \sigma \) = Effect due to the interaction among the levels of occupational experience and industry type

\( \beta \sigma \) = Effect due to the interaction among the levels of employment and industry type

\( \alpha \beta \sigma \) = Effect due to the interaction among the levels of occupational experience, employment level and industry type

\( \eta \) = Effect due to the covariate total employment

\( \xi \) = Error term associated with each observation