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Chapter one is divided into six sections: (1) the background of the study, (2) the need and purpose for the study, (3) the statement of the problem, (4) the statement of the hypotheses, (5) the limitations, and (6) the definition of terms.

Background of the Study

An Historical Review of MDE and DECA

Vocational education received its first federal funds through appropriations provided by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. As a result of this legislation, funding was provided for agricultural education, home economics education, and trade and industrial education. In 1917, Congress was highly concerned with the scientific and technical achievements of its military adversary, Germany. The need for marketing and distribution was not recognized until later.

Many vocational educators believe that federal legislation provides the catalyst for particular program development.
Crawford (1972) states:

Legislation is a human activity. It is a response to a human need at a given time in history. Congress and state legislatures respond to the demands of the constituencies at the time the legislation is considered. Our social, economic, and political environments change constantly and one may expect legislation to reflect the contemporary educational philosophy.

The development of marketing and distributive education programs and enrollments certainly have followed this pattern. Prior to 1937, marketing and distributive education developed very slowly. There were retailing programs in comprehensive high schools in large cities, but more prevalent was the occupational course in salesmanship. Then came the passage of the George-Deen Act of 1936 which became effective in 1937.

Although the authorization for expenditures was small and was limited to those persons already employed in marketing and distributive occupations, the field was specifically defined, and a definite body of content was identified. With the passage of the George-Barden Act (1947), there was an increase in money authorized for appropriation. There was also increased flexibility for cooperative vocational education as the Act provided for reimbursing local education agencies for part of the cost of equipment and supplies.
Subsequent legislation removed the employment restrictions, provided even more flexibility, and more importantly, shifted from categorical funding to funding based on manpower needs. Today, vocational funds are available for secondary, post-secondary, adult, and special needs programs in marketing and distributive education.

Several of those who are concerned with the field have provided various definitions of marketing and distributive education. One of those is Crawford (1972) who defined marketing and distributive education as:

A vocational program designed to meet the needs of persons who have entered or are preparing to enter a distributive occupation or an occupation requiring competency in one or more of the marketing functions.

Another of those providing a definition is Corbin (1975) who adds:

Marketing and distributive education programs are now offered at secondary, post-secondary, and collegiate levels. Each level has unique goals and objectives. However, a commonality for the three levels and an integral part of the program at all three levels is the vocational student organization known as the Distributive Education Clubs of America. The curricula in marketing and distributive education are composed of three learning experiences: (1) classroom instruction, (2) in school and/or on-the-job simulated or actual work experience, and (3) a student organization.
Gleason (1984) states:

The term "marketing and distributive education" (MDE) has come into use since 1980 to describe publicly funded marketing education programs organized and implemented at the pre-baccalaureate level.

According to Crawford (1972), the national organization of DECA was initiated in April, 1947, in Memphis, Tennessee, with the constitution and name, Distributive Education Clubs of America, being adopted in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1948. There are now fifty-two affiliated state associations (including Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia) in the national organization. The constitution adopted at the 1970 National Leadership Conference in Minneapolis provided for Collegiate, Alumni, and Professional Divisions in addition to the High School and Delta Epsilon Chi (formerly Junior Collegiate) Divisions set up by the earlier constitution.

The Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA was established in 1960 after the inception of DECA at the high school level. It emerged as the Post-Secondary Division with a series of contests for the post-secondary students at the 1960 National Leadership Conference. From 1966 until 1984, the Delta Epsilon Chi Division has grown in membership during only five of the eighteen membership years. In eight out of the last ten years (1974-1984) there has
been a downward trend in chapter membership with only fiscal years 1974 and 1977 showing increases. A chronological history of the Delta Epsilon Chi national membership by number of members is shown in Table 1. The table also gives the number of chapters, total membership, and percent of change from the previous year in both number of chapters and membership. As can be seen in Table 1, there has been a decrease in membership and chapters during the years 1980-1984.

**Need for the Study**

Crawford (1967) determined the basic beliefs concerning all phases of marketing and distributive education programs. The study contained 96 basic statements which are generally accepted as the nationally recognized philosophy of marketing and distributive education. Two of the 96 basic belief statements related directly to DECA. These statements were:

1. That Distributive Education Clubs of America is a youth organization providing a program of activities which complements and enriches distributive education.

2. That DECA, the youth organization for high school and post-secondary school students, should be co-curricular in that it should provide opportunities normally learned in the classroom and on-the-job. It also provides opportunities to acquire additional competencies, such as leadership and social skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CHAPTERS</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>% CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966-1967</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>5,171</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1971</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>6,229</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5,895</td>
<td>(4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>6,595</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>7,062</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>8,121</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>8,368</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>7,632</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1978</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>7,242</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-1979</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>7,528</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1980</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9,454</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>7,857</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1982</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>(8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1984</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>5,977</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both of these statements from the Crawford study received a high degree of agreement among participants of the study, thereby indicating that the participants felt that DECA was co-curricular and that the respondents believed that DECA plays an important role in the total marketing and distributive education program. Crawford's study established a philosophical base for marketing and distributive education and strengthened the concept that the student organization is an integral part of the total program.

Missouri's marketing and distributive education (MDE) personnel, including Vocational State Department of Education personnel, MDE instructors, and DECA advisers, along with the MDE educational leaders from other states, believe that DECA is a major component in teaching and delivering MDE competencies. Henkel (1965) conducted one of the first research-based studies that dealt with post-secondary DECA. His study revealed that students said they benefitted in five ways from DECA activities: (1) They improved their ability to meet and deal effectively with people; (2) they improved their self-expression; (3) the activities develop their leadership abilities; (4) that DECA helped them develop their confidence; and (5) that the activities provided them with a better knowledge of marketing.
According to the Missouri State Department of Education, Missouri MDE educators are extremely alarmed at the decreasing number of post-secondary students participating in the Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA. (In 1980-1981, there were 335 student members; the number decreased to 233 student members by 1981-1982; there were only 100 post-secondary DECA members in 1982-1983; the membership has remained stable in 1983-1984 at 102 student members.) Declining DECA membership, coupled with increasing credit hours and enrollment in MDE courses, creates a problem for post-secondary MDE educators.

Junior Collegiate DECA (Delta Epsilon Chi) was chartered in Missouri in 1967. There was a steady growth in membership as well as in the number of chapters from 1967 through 1975. Membership then declined in six of the last nine years (1975-1984).

The highest number of chapters was eight during the period 1975-1984. Membership losses were shown for the years from 1976 through 1979. Membership, however, did have an increase of 81.7 percent for 1980 and an increase of 30.9 percent for 1981. These gains were offset by membership losses of 30.4 percent for 1982 and 57.1 percent for 1983. From a peak membership of 364 members in 1975, the 1984 Missouri roster for Junior Collegiate DECA (Delta Epsilon Chi) showed only 102 members. The number
of chapters for 1984 was six, three less than the peak year of 1975 when nine chapters were active in Missouri.

A chronological history of Missouri post-secondary DECA showing number of chapters and membership over the period 1967 to 1984 can be found in Table 2.

Jack Bitzenburg (1984), Missouri’s State Department Consultant for MDE, has stated that Missouri MDE educators have expressed a need to evaluate DECA and to determine the future thrust or changes needed for the survival of DECA at the post-secondary level. These educators believe that the nationally accepted DECA goals should be prioritized utilizing the varying populations who make up the student membership, MDE instructors, and DECA advisers. They also believe that additional data must be collected and analyzed about the groups who comprise the Missouri Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA, and that there should be a determination of additional goals not identified by National DECA while also determining if there are goals that should be deleted.

Purpose of the Study

The Missouri State Department Consultant for MDE, Jack Bitzenburg (1984) has stated that in Missouri, marketing and distributive education is a dynamic and changing field with new developments and changes taking place. He believes that these new developments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CHAPTERS</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>% CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1971</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-1973</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1977</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1978</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-1979</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>(28.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1980</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1982</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1984</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and changes have created educational needs for those entering
the work force as well as for those already employed, and that
technological advances and discoveries are creating needs for
technical skills development as well as related personnel and
human resource changes and adaptations.

Post-secondary marketing and management programs have
begun to meet these challenges. Nationally, DECA is accepted
as a vital component of the teaching and learning strategy. In
1979, Eugene Callahan identified the national post-secondary
DECA goals. These goals are an integral component in determin-
ing the program content and direction of post-secondary DECA
chapters.

In Missouri, the recent trend toward declining enrollments
in post-secondary DECA indicates that the Missouri Delta Epsilon
Chi Division is not being used by student members to achieve the
accepted DECA goals identified in the 1979 study. Two possible
explanations for this trend are: First, the goals of post-secondary
DECA stressed by advisers and instructors may not be the same
goals which marketing and distributive education student members
believe are most important. Secondly, the relative importance
of various post-secondary DECA goals as determined in the 1979
national study may not match the relative importance assigned by
the Missouri post-secondary DECA participants.

Post-secondary DECA may be one way for marketing and
distributive education programs to meet the training needs of
current and future marketing personnel. Since the twelve goals
identified for post-secondary DECA are the major determinants of
the activities conducted in DECA chapters, it is important that the
perceptions of Missouri post-secondary DECA participants concern-
ing the goals of the organization be assessed. More specifically,
the following two needs are imminent:

1. Data related to the importance assigned to each of
the twelve national goals must be collected and assessed from the
various sub-groups of participants (DECA student members, MDE
instructors, DECA advisers) of Missouri's post-secondary DECA.

2. Data related to the priority rating of each of the
twelve national goals by various sub-groups of participants in
Missouri's post-secondary DECA must be collected and analyzed.

The purpose of this study, then, was to determine if Missouri
post-secondary DECA student members, marketing and distributive
education instructors, and DECA advisers agree in their assess-
ments of the relative importance of the nationally identified goals
for post-secondary DECA. In addition, this study sought to
determine if the priority ratings of the twelve nationally
identified goals by the three groups of Missouri participants in post-secondary DECA are similar. This study also provided Missouri participants in post-secondary DECA the opportunity to add or delete goals from the list identified in the national study.

The results of this study can be utilized by Missouri marketing and distributive education personnel to determine the future emphasis of post-secondary DECA in the overall marketing and distributive education curricula. The findings have direct implications for the relevance of DECA marketing and distributive education outcomes.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to determine the importance assigned to the national post-secondary DECA goals by Missouri's post-secondary DECA student members, marketing and distributive education instructors and DECA advisers, and to identify the priority rating of these goals by each subgroup. Increased MDE enrollment and decreasing membership in DECA may be explained by a lack of congruence between the two sample groups in terms of perception of the twelve national DECA goals. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to answer the following questions:

1. How do Missouri DECA student members, and the group consisting of MDE instructors and DECA advisers rate the
priority of the nationally derived post-secondary DECA goals?

2. How do Missouri DECA student members and the group consisting of MDE instructors and DECA advisers rank the importance of the nationally derived post-secondary DECA goals?

3. What are the characteristics of Missouri post-secondary participants?

Statement of the Hypotheses

Stated in the null form for the purpose of statistical treatment, the following hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.

1. There is no significant difference between Missouri post-secondary DECA student members' ratings on the priority of the nationally derived post-secondary DECA goals and those of the group consisting of Missouri MDE instructors and DECA advisers' ratings.

2. There is no significant difference between Missouri post-secondary DECA student members' ranking of importance of the nationally derived post-secondary DECA goals and those of the group consisting of Missouri MDE instructors and DECA advisers.

Limitations of the Study

1. Generalizations and interpretations taken from this study apply only to Missouri DECA advisers, post-secondary DECA student
members, and marketing and distributive education instructors who responded to the questionnaire and participated in the study.

2. Missouri post-secondary student members, and the marketing and distributive education instructors/DECA advisers may not have had the same knowledge and expertise with regard to all activities of the Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA.

3. Missouri post-secondary DECA student members, DECA advisers, and marketing and distributive education instructors may not have interpreted terminology, definitions, and the goal statements in the same manner.

4. Instrumentation - Reliability is limited to interrater reliability based on perceptions held by the group members regarding DECA goals. Validity of the study, however, was enhanced by the development of the instrument by a panel of experts.

5. The study was developmental in nature and did not specify how or to what degree goals were met.

6. The study defined the goals as terminal objectives. This definition was among many that could have been selected or applied.

7. This study reflected only the opinions of Missouri post-secondary DECA student member respondents in addition to those DECA advisers and marketing and distributive education instructor respondents who were full time employees of local educational agencies.
Definition of Terms

1. Marketing and Distributive Education Program—A vocational instructional program designed to meet the needs of persons who have entered, or who are preparing to enter, a distributive occupation or an occupation requiring competency in one or more of the marketing functions. Such programs offer instruction in marketing, merchandising, related management, and personal development (Crawford, 1972).

2. Post-Secondary Institution—One whose programs include students who have completed or discontinued high school and who are available for study in preparation for entering the labor market (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1972).

3. Marketing and Distributive Education—Marketing and Distributive Education describes publicly funded marketing education programs organized and implemented at the pre-baccalaureate level (Gleason, 1984).

4. Vocational Education—Training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work and remedial or related academic technical instruction incident thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a state board or local educational agency, and which is conducted as part
of a program designed to prepare individuals for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers or technicians or sub-professionals in recognized occupations and in new and emerging occupations or to prepare individuals for enrollment in advanced technical education programs but excluding any program to prepare individuals for employment in occupations generally considered professional or which require a baccalaureate or higher degree (Christiansen, 1977).

5. Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA)—The national youth organization for students enrolled in marketing and distributive education programs. DECA is an integral part of the marketing and distributive education instructional program and is designed to develop future leaders for marketing and distribution. DECA is the only national youth organization operating within the nation's schools to attract young people to careers in marketing, merchandising, and management. DECA is composed of five divisions: (a) Secondary, (b) Collegiate, (c) Delta Epsilon Chi (Junior Collegiate), (d) Professional, and (e) Alumni.

(a) Secondary Division—Local chapters of Distributive Education Clubs of America composed of students enrolled in high school programs of marketing and distributive education.

(b) Collegiate—Local chapters of Distributive Education Clubs of America composed
of undergraduate and graduate students preparing for careers as professional marketing and distributive educators in institutions approved under provisions of each State Plan for Vocational Education for the training of marketing and distributive education instructional personnel.

(c) Delta Epsilon Chi (Junior Collegiate)—
Local chapters of Distributive Education Clubs of America composed of students enrolled in less than baccalaureate marketing and distributive education degree programs.

(d) Professional—A division within the Distributive Education Clubs of America composed of marketing and distributive education teachers-coordinators, marketing and distributive education local and state supervisors, employers of students, marketing and distributive education students and parents of DECA members, advisory committee members, school administrators, teachers, and others willing to contribute to the growth and development of DECA.

(e) Alumni—Local chapters of the Distributive Education Clubs of America established by those who have previously been enrolled in marketing and distributive education programs, as well as those who have graduated from a marketing and distributive education program (DECA Handbook, 1975).

6. Goal—The term used to identify Krathwohl's first level of specificity of objectives which uses broad and general statements toward which several years of education might be aimed or for which students might strive. The term is also used to identify the terminal objectives defined by Ammerman and Melching "in which
student action is stated at the level of meaningful unit of performance" (Krathwohl, 1968).

7. Vocationally Reimbursed Programs—In Missouri, those programs for which the Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is responsible for disbursing federal and state allocated vocational-technical monies (Missouri DECA Membership Report, 1984).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of the relevant literature is organized into four parts. The first part is an overview of American vocational education student organizations. Part two deals with an historical review of the Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA), with an emphasis on the Delta Epsilon Chi Division. The third section reviews the research conducted in distributive education as it relates to DECA. Part four reviews the goals and governing documents of DECA.

American Vocational Education Student Organizations

Hanson and Carlson (1972) stated that "youth groups are as old as the human race; however, nationwide organizations complete with purposes, planned programs, definite structure, and voluntary membership are a distinctive modern phenomenon."

There are a number of organizations serving youth. Callahan (1979) identified eight organizations that are designed specifically for students in vocational education programs. These include:
Future Farmers of America (FFA), founded in 1928,
Future Homemakers of America (FHA) and Home Economics Related Occupations (HERO), founded in 1945,
Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA) and Phi Beta Lambda (PBL), founded in 1945,
Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA), founded in 1948,
Vocational Industrial Clubs of America (VICA), founded in 1965,
Office Education Association (OEA), founded in 1966,
American Industrial Arts Student Association (AIASA), founded in 1972, and
Health Occupations Students of America (HOSA), founded in 1976.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 gave rise to the formation of vocational student organizations. Teske (1970) examined the purpose for the existence of vocational education youth organizations and submitted that such organizations are designed:

(1) to further develop the leadership and hence fellowship abilities of the individual,
(2) to further develop the citizenship abilities of the individual, and (3) to
develop the scholarship abilities of the individual.

In relation to the three purposes, Teske stated that "learning is changing the behavior of the individual" and that "youth organizations are an integral part of vocational education."

In 1966, U. S. Senator Pell of Rhode Island commissioned a study which was to draw together all basic information on all national youth organizations within the United States. The report, Profiles of Youth—1966, indicated one single fact for all organizations—each group had a stated specific purpose.

Corbin (1975) pointed out that "research studies centered on the goals and objectives of vocational youth organizations are quite sparse. Because goals have not been specified in measurable terms, sound research has not been conducted."

Johnson and Faunce (1952) stated that probably the spontaneity of student activity at its best is to be found in a well organized school club which brings together a group of individuals with a common interest. Banning (1970), on the other hand, pointed out that only one of three youths between the ages of 5 and 24 belong to an organization in spite of the effectiveness of these groups in the past.

Teske (1970) stated that if "learning is changing the behavior of the individual" and "youth organizations are an integral part of
vocational education," then youth groups should deal with the total individual rather than the leadership, citizenship, and scholarship suggested by the purpose of youth organizations.

Evans (1971) indicated that youth organizations have proved to be much more resistant to change than have the vocational education programs which gave birth to them. Thus, there seems to be pros and cons related to the current status of many youth groups in the country. Callahan (1979) noted that "the post-secondary division of DECA has experienced very little change since its formation. The willingness to initiate and accept change could be a determining factor in the future direction of DECA."

Vance and Bregman (1970) pointed out that youth organizations can provide individual and collective goals to help young people learn more about the world of work and increase their self-realization. It should be pointed out that most literature prior to the late 1970's refers to "youth organization" while the term "student organization" is used more frequently since that time. This is especially significant when one considers the wide age ranges of members in these organizations.

McKnown (1929) noted that:

> The school club program offers many opportunities for the proper guidance and education of the pupil in important phases of citizenship because
phases other than the intellectual are emphasized. It is based upon vital pupil interest, and opportunity for participation is provided in these activities. The club is built upon the basis of "learn and do" and not upon that of "learn."

This type of attitude expressed by McKnown and others may well be the impetus for the organization of some of the vocational student organizations.

**Historical Review of Distributive Education**

**Clubs of America with Emphasis on the**

**Delta Epsilon Chi Division**

The growth and development of distributive education clubs in the 1940's created an awareness to review and organize the direction to be taken by the clubs. A national planning committee was appointed during the 1946 American Vocational Association's convention in Buffalo, New York, to develop a tentative plan for the organization of DECA on the national level. The National Advisory Committee met in Washington, D. C., with three U. S. Office of Education staff members from March 2-4, 1946, to prepare tentative plans for the organization. A tentative constitution was proposed for the distributive education youth organizations.

This planning session in Washington, D. C., set up the
first National Interstate Conference in Memphis, Tennessee, in April, 1947. Twenty-two states had representatives attending the meeting where a resolution was adopted that gave birth to the DECA organization. The second Interstate Conference of Distributive Education Clubs was held in St. Louis, March 22-24, 1948. A tentative constitution was approved and the name, Distributive Education Clubs of America, was adopted.

DeBenning's article in the May, 1948, American Vocational Education Journal entitled "Distributive Education Clubs of America" stated:

The Constitution states the purposes of the National Association of Clubs to be furthering the welfare of its members in the following ways:

a. To develop progressive leadership in the field of distribution that is competent, aggressive, self-reliant, and cooperative.

b. To provide for an intelligent choice of occupations in distribution through exploration of opportunities in the field.

c. To create in each member an abiding interest in his chosen occupation through an appreciation of the opportunity it offers him to contribute his share in a worthy home and community.

d. To encourage the use of high ethical standards in business.
e. To provide for mental and physical health through satisfactory social and recreational activities.

f. To foster a deep feeling of responsibility for contributing through business activities to the civic, social, and moral welfare of society.

g. To develop an appreciation of the influence of fine arts in business.

h. To engender a healthy respect for vocational education and a desire to keep abreast of current developments in business through use of the training facilities it offers, both in school and adult life.

The purposes were discussed, and Strobel (1948) stated, "a difference in opinion still existed at the time that the conference adjourned." There is no evidence that DeBenning's purposes were ever adopted.

In DECA: The First Thirty Years, Riley (1976) pointed out that "some of the early names considered included Future Retailers, Future Distributors, Distributors, Future Merchants, and Distributive Education Clubs."

The DECA Handbook (1972) states that the official name, Distributive Education Youth Organization, was changed to the "Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA)" on January 10, 1950, and chartered under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia.
Callahan (1979), referring to DECA, states that "Monday, March 22, 1948, saw the adoption of the constitution, the emblem, national dues, and the colors." The marketing and distributive high school program continued to grow, yet it would not be until 1959 that proposals would be made to develop a post-high school DECA program.

These plans were developed at the 13th annual leadership conference in 1959. Junior college members met with the Board of Trustees of DECA, Incorporated. Their major task was to develop contests for post-secondary DECA for the 1960 National Leadership Conference in Kansas City.

Riley (1976) pointed out that "provisions were allowed during April 8-23, 1960, Board of Trustees Meeting for the post-secondary division and that three contests would be provided during the 1961 National Leadership Conference." Post-secondary DECA elected its first officers in 1962. By 1966, a proposal was passed at the April Board of Directors meeting to separate the high school and post-secondary divisions. Beginning in 1967, the post-secondary division conducted their own National Leadership Conference. Riley (1976) states that the name was formally adopted and used; the post-secondary division assumed its new name, the Junior Collegiate Division of DECA. This would remain for the next decade.
Even though the new division showed growth in all but two years, 1959 and 1978, many individuals showed concern, finding that the growth was not substantial.

Callahan (1979) indicates that "The first Junior Collegiate DECA Planning and Objectives Conference was held in Kansas City, Missouri, during July 28–30, 1974." The meeting was coordinated by Don Bradley, a Junior Collegiate Chapter Adviser, and was attended by 74 Junior Collegiate Chapter Advisers, state supervisors, students, and National DECA staff members. The major agenda item concerned the need to clarify goals and objectives for the Junior Collegiate Division.

Riley (1976) stated that "the 1974 Junior Collegiate DECA Planning and Objectives Conference was the most positive and informative conference held thus far as it attempted to deal with Junior Collegiate problems and concerns." Further conferences were held in 1975, 1976, and 1977, as the DECA, Inc., Board of Directors initiated the Junior Collegiate Task Force in 1974 to deal with problems faced by the Junior Collegiate Division.

Since 1976, however, chapter membership has shown a decrease in four of six years through 1982 on the national level. The chapter membership was 8,368 in 1976 and 5,977 in 1984. The number of chapters had shown steady growth until 1980, at which time there
were 300 chapters in the country.

There have been other changes taking place with DECA in the 1980's. Junior Collegiate DECA is now known as the Delta Epsilon Chi Division. There have been leadership changes in the organization during the last two years. Several state associations are having drastic drops in membership which is causing national concern.

In summary, the Delta Epsilon Chi Division is in a state of transition. There are strong indications based upon chapter and membership losses that a new direction or a re-emphasis of goals is needed for this division.

Research in Marketing and Distributive Education Related to DECA

Although all eight of the vocational education student organizations recognized by the Department of Education have goals or purposes, there are a very limited number of research studies concerned with the goals and objectives of these organizations.

In 1957, Gradoni conducted a study to measure the accomplishments of marketing and distributive education students. He indicated that there was a need to have all facets of marketing and distributive education restated in immediate and measureable goals. Meyer and Logan (1966) supported Gradoni's conclusion
when they stated in *The Review and Synthesis of Research in Distributive Education*, that his conclusion was "a recommendation that still has not been fulfilled."

A study concerning issues in marketing and distributive education was conducted by Warmke (1960). Warmke identified current issues in marketing and distributive education by surveying leaders in the field on certain selected issues. He found that over 80 percent of them felt that DECA should be educational.

Bicanich (1964) conducted a study that dealt with the distributive education student's attitude toward DECA. His study indicated that over 80 percent felt that DECA did benefit them.

Henkel (1965) conducted one of the first research studies that dealt with DECA. He attempted to study the benefits that post-secondary students in Wisconsin received from club activities. The majority felt that DECA benefitted them in the following ways: (1) Club activities improved their ability to meet and deal with people effectively; (2) DECA developed leadership abilities; (3) it helped them to improve self-expression; (4) it helped them develop self-confidence; and (5) DECA activities provided them with better knowledge of marketing.

Cotterell (1966) carried out a study concerned with factors influencing participation in DECA in Minnesota. One interesting
outcome of this study was that coordinators did not clearly understand the goals and objectives of the club.

Meyer and Logan (1966) concluded in the *Review and Synthesis of Research in Distributive Education* that:

> although the Distributive Education Clubs of America membership has experienced excellent growth and is highly regarded in most states as an integral part of the marketing and distributive education program, very few research studies dealing with clubs and co-curricular activities were found.

Ashmun and Larson (1970) in *The Review and Synthesis of Research in Distributive Education* covering the years 1966-1968 concluded: "Even though club activities receive a great deal of attention and publicity, there were no studies located that dealt with clubs as such."

Berns, Burrows, and Wallace (1981) found no evidence of research related to DECA outside of isolated studies. They presented no specific conclusion or recommendation concerning DECA.

Crawford (1967) conducted a study which contained 96 basic belief statements which have been accepted as the nationally recognized philosophy of marketing and distributive education. Only two of the statements, however, were related to DECA. These statements were:

1. That Distributive Education Clubs of America
is a youth organization providing a program of activities which complements and enriches distributive education's curriculum.

2. That DECA, the youth organization for high school and post-secondary students should be co-curricular in that it should provide opportunities to further develop competencies normally learned in the classroom and on the job.

Krier (1971) established a formal research effort to determine the purposes of DECA. He did a national sampling of marketing and distributive teacher-educators and marketing and distributive education teacher-coordinators' perceptions of the purposes of DECA. The study revealed that perceptions of marketing and distributive educators in regard to the purposes of DECA were different than the views of teacher educators. He found the MDE coordinators placed a greater value on competition.

Weatherford (1972) conducted a study which analyzed 52 issues in marketing and distributive education. Only two of these issues dealt with DECA. One hundred percent of the respondents agreed that "the DECA program of youth activities should be viewed as a co-curricular activity." The majority of respondents agreed with the second statement that "the present activities of DECA were effectively accomplishing the goals of the organization."

Daily (1972) in his study demonstrated that there can be
desireable outcomes in DECA activities. Several other studies by Snell (1967), Sethney (1967), Bregman (1968), Vomhof (1969), and Whitney (1970) dealt with competitive events in DECA. Corbin (1975) concluded that these studies did not speak to the issue of goals and objectives of DECA except to lend support to the importance of this particular aspect of DECA.

Coplan (1972) in the DECA Evaluation Report of 1972, concluded that "student-oriented goals and objectives need to be established." He further indicated that the present goals of DECA needed clarification.

Corbin (1975) carried out a study concerned with DECA which attempted "the formation via a consensus of thirty experts of goals and objectives for the High School Division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America." His study, utilizing the Delphi technique, formulated and prioritized 12 goals and 72 objectives for the High School Division of DECA. Corbin concluded that the 72 objectives serve as the actions, knowledge, and skills which the DECA member must learn to attain these goals.

Lynch (1983) advocated the DECA organization change its name to the Association of Marketing Education Students. He thought that not only should the name change take place, but that DECA's goals should be reviewed and revised.
Callahan (1979) was the most recent to deal with identification of goals for the Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA. In his study, Callahan, using the Delphi technique, set out to determine goals for the Junior Collegiate Division of DECA. The goals were developed by a five-member advisory committee and ranked by a 22-member research jury and used a sample population of 100 Junior Collegiate chapter advisers. Callahan (1979) states "that his study, The Identification of Goals for the Junior Collegiate Division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America, established, developed, and ranked the 12 goals according to five levels of priority and five rank order of importance." The 12 goals are:

1. To develop communication skills required in business.

2. To develop leadership skills as they apply to business activities.

3. To develop an understanding of marketing, management, and merchandising as a part of the free enterprise system.

4. To develop identified business competencies through intervention with business leaders representing the various areas of marketing and distribution.
5. To develop social skills required in business.

6. To provide post-secondary DECA members an avenue for career identification and development.

7. To provide post-secondary DECA members an avenue for economic development.

8. To provide post-secondary DECA members an avenue for understanding the responsibilities of citizenship in the United States.

9. To provide post-secondary DECA members an avenue for self-development.

10. To challenge post-secondary DECA members to think, create, learn, and manage in their areas of occupational interest.

11. To prepare students to function in entry-level supervisory and management assignments and positions.

12. To provide opportunities for students to plan, organize, direct, and control a program of work.

**Goals and Governing Documents of DECA**

This section of the chapter is intended to review the development of goal statements and to review the current status of the governing documents of DECA, Inc., and DECA as it relates to
purposes, goals, and objectives.

The development of goals has had limited attention during recent years. A careful review of the available literature indicates much of what has been written deals with the development of objectives rather than of goals.

The early works were related to educational objectives. Tyler did extensive work with educational objectives from 1934-1942. Mager's programmed learning text, *Preparing Instructional Objectives* (1962), was the catalyst agent for the behavioral objective movement. Krathwohl's (1965) discussion in the article "Stating Objectives Appropriately for Program, for Curriculum, and for Instructional Materials Development," centered around the needs for varying degrees of objectives.

Remmers and Gage (1955) believe that "statements of objectives should contain only actual guiding purposes, should deal with mental processes, and should be determined by individual and social needs." Finally, Geis (1972) adds consensus by saying, "The objective should be just specific enough to accomplish the job for which it is designed."

Krathwohl (1964) stated there were three levels of specificity depending on how the objectives will be used. According to him, at the first and least concrete level, statements are quite broad
and general; at the second and more concrete level, a behavioral objective orientation helps to analyze broad goals into specific ones; and third and finally, there is the most concrete level, which is needed to create instructional materials. Along similar lines, Kibler, Barker, and Miles (1970) suggested three levels of specificity: (1) broad educational objectives or goals, (2) informational objectives, and (3) planning goals which are very specific.

Several authors (Geis, 1972; Kibler, 1970; Remmers and Gage, 1955; and Tyler, 1948) all held the philosophical views on the level of specificity which were very close to Krathwohl's (1965) three-dimensional classification scheme. Corbin (1975) states that this model was used by Hawkins (1968) and Sites (1968).

Callahan (1979) states that "the design of his study, The Identification of Goals for Junior Collegiate Division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America, utilizes Krathwohl's first level of specificity. No attempt was made to identify objectives, either intermediate or specific, for the Junior Collegiate Division of DECA.

DECA began its 38th year of operation in 1984. The organization has grown from a small group of states in 1946 to a federation of over 50 state associations. Callahan (1979) states, "The seedbeds of DECA are the members, both present and future."
Any organization must exist for a purpose. DECA, Inc., (1975) Article of Incorporation lists the following purposes:

1. To assist state associations in the growth and development of DECA.

2. To further develop education in marketing and distribution which will contribute to occupational competence.

3. To promote understanding and appreciation for the responsibilities of citizenship in our free competitive enterprise system.

Three purposes were identified by the DECA Constitution which was developed in 1972. They were:

1. To assist Chartered Associations of DECA in their growth and development.

2. To complement and enrich the development of the occupational competence necessary for careers in marketing and distribution.

3. To promote understanding and appreciation for the responsibilities of citizenship in our private competitive enterprise system.

Callahan (1979) pointed out the following concerning purposes set forth in the governing documents of DECA:
The DECA, Incorporated, Article of Incorporation lists three purposes of the organization. These purposes are almost identical in content to those contained in the Constitution. The similarity in the stated purposes of the two major governing documents raises the question: 'How can DECA, Incorporated, a federation of fifty state associations, have the same purpose as DECA, the student organization sponsored by DECA, Incorporated?'

Callahan (1979) also made the following points concerning the discrepancies in the Bylaws of the five divisions of DECA:

A review of five sets of Bylaws reveal that neither the High School Alumni Division nor the Junior Collegiate Division of DECA have purposes, goals, or objectives. The Collegiate and Alumni Divisions list three stated purposes in their respective Bylaws. The Professional Division Bylaws list goals and seven objectives.

In summary, DECA has three stated purposes which appear to be almost identical in the DECA Constitution and in the DECA, Incorporated, Articles of Incorporation. There are five sets of Bylaws for the five divisions of DECA, yet two of the divisions have no stated goals; one has a written purpose which is not in the Bylaws; two have stated purposes; and only one has both goals and objectives. There was little or no continuity in the governing documents of the organizations until 1977.

Starting in 1977, there were a series of planning meetings which undertook to make the necessary changes to gain continuity in
the governing documents. In 1977, the Long-Range Planning Council of DECA, Incorporated, Board of Directors started to review the governing documents. A series of meetings were held in October, 1977, through January, 1978. Callahan (1979) stated:

that the Long-Range Planning Council met on January 16-17, 1978, in Reston, Virginia. The Council prepared four recommendations for the Governance Committee. Recommendation number one dealt with retaining the present DECA, Incorporated, Articles of Incorporation. The second recommendation dealt with four proposed goals for DECA and their possible inclusion into the DECA Constitution. The third recommendation dealt with approving the twelve goals identified in the Corbin (1975) study as the goals for the High School Division of DECA. The fourth recommendation concerned the encouragement of research-based projects to determine the goals of Junior Collegiate, Collegiate Alumni, and Professional Divisions.

The Governance Committee met on February 2-3, 1978, and concurred with recommendations one and two. The committee did not agree that further action was necessary on recommendation three. The Governance Committee concurred with recommendation four and recommended that the Board of Directors initiate projects to identify the goals and purposes unique to each division (minutes, Governance Committee, February, 1978).

This series of events helped to set the scene for a smooth
revision process of all governing documents of DECA. The High School Division adopted a set of 12 research-based goals for its members. The Callahan study of 1979 was designed to identify the goals for the Junior Collegiate Division, which is currently called the Delta Epsilon Chi Division.

Summary

This review of literature indicated that vocational student organizations are predicated on purposes. This is indicated by the 1966 report by Senator Pell entitled Profiles of Youth. The report indicated that all youth organizations had a specific purpose. Corbin (1975) pointed out that research studies on goals and purposes are sparse, but they are essential to each organization. Corbin indicated that more research was needed in the areas of purposes and goals.

Evans (1971) and Callahan (1975) both indicate that vocational youth organizations have been more resistant to change than desired. However, Vance and Bregman (1970) noted that youth organizations are very valuable in providing young people with the opportunity to learn more about the world of work even though the organization may be slow to change.

Gradoni (1957) conducted a study to measure the accomplishments of MDE students and found the need to have all facets of MDE
re-stated in immediate and measureable goals. Meyer and Logen (1966) supported Gradoni's conclusion.

Ashmun and Larson (1970) concluded that there was a lack of studies dealing with DECA. This was supported by the research conducted by Berns, Burrows, and Wallace (1981). Their study indicated only isolated research being conducted in DECA.

The major studies that have been conducted with DECA included the 1967 Crawford study, which established the 96 belief statements concerning MDE and DECA; the 1975 Corbin study, which prioritized 12 goals and 72 objectives for the High School Division of DECA; and the 1979 Callahan study, which dealt with the identification of goals for the Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA.

As a result of this review of the literature, it is evident that the High School Division of DECA has been dealt with more thoroughly than the Delta Epsilon Chi Division with respect to goals. It is also evident that more studies are needed to supplement the 1979 Callahan study in the realm of goals as it relates to the Delta Epsilon Chi Division.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN, METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the design of the study, sample, instrumentation, and research procedures.

The research design utilized in this study may be classified as ex post facto as described by Kerlinger (1979):

Ex post facto research is 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.

This study was conducted as an exploratory field study to determine how DECA student members, DECA advisers and MDE instructors of Missouri's Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA perceived the nationally derived goals for post-secondary DECA. Specifically, the study was conducted to determine if DECA student members, DECA advisers and MDE instructors in Missouri post-secondary DECA are characterized by different ratings for the
priority assigned to nationally derived goals for post-secondary
DECA.

Kerlinger (1979) states that exploratory field studies have three
purposes. They are performed to discover significant variables in
the field situation, to discover relations among variables, and to
lay groundwork for later more systematic and rigorous testing of
hypotheses. Kerlinger also reports that field studies are strong in
their realism, significance, strength of variables, theory orienta-
tion, and heuristic qualities.

Sample

The sample of the study consisted of 95 student members
of the Missouri Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA and 37 MDE
instructors and DECA advisers from six post-secondary programs.

Instrumentation

Many techniques have been used to collect expert opinion
regarding various topics of concern in educational research. One
is the survey method which involves contacting samples of individuals
or a defined population, treating each individually, and developing
an average of responses. After reviewing several forecasting
techniques, this researcher concluded that the described survey
process was the most appropriate methodology available to
accomplish the objectives of this study.
A review of the literature failed to yield available instruments which would satisfy all of the specific needs of this study; therefore, an instrument was constructed which is similar to the instrument utilized to collect data for the 1979 Callahan study.

Callahan (1979) conducted a study in order that the national post-secondary division of DECA might have clearly defined goals. It was apparent to Callahan that without goals, there was nothing to provide direction for the post-secondary division of DECA. Considering the research methodology to be employed in this study and its objectives, it was thought prudent to utilize the Callahan study statements which identified the post-secondary DECA goals at the national level.

The survey utilized in this study, therefore, contained the 12 Callahan statements with instructions to rate the importance of each goal on a 1 to 6 point Likert scale. Scale anchors were as follows: 1, "Extremely High Priority"; 2, "High Priority"; 3, "Medium Priority"; 4, "Low Priority"; 5, "Extremely Low Priority"; and 6, "Do Not Include". The Callahan statements were:

1. To develop communication skills required in business.

2. To develop leadership skills as they apply to business activities.
3. To develop an understanding of marketing, management, and merchandising as a part of the free enterprise system.

4. To develop identified business competencies through interaction with business leaders representing the various areas of marketing and distribution.

5. To develop social skills required in business.

6. To provide post-secondary DECA members an avenue for career identification and development.

7. To provide post-secondary DECA members an avenue for development of economic understanding.

8. To provide Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA members an avenue for understanding the responsibilities of citizenship in the United States.

9. To provide Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA members an avenue for self-development.

10. To challenge Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA members to think, create, learn, and manage in the areas of occupational interest.

11. To prepare students to function in entry-level supervisory and management assignments and positions.
12. To provide opportunities for students to plan, organize, direct, and control a program of work.

Also included in the survey was a yes-no question which asked if additional goals should be added. If the answer was yes, the goals were to be listed.

For purposes of describing the Missouri post-secondary DECA participants, demographic data were also collected. These data are further described in the data collection section of this chapter. A copy of the survey instrument may be found in Appendix A. The data collected included the priorities rated on a 1 to 6 point scale and a rank order of goals for each group.

Data Collection Procedures

The population included all Delta Epsilon Chi DECA student members, vocationally reimbursed instructors, and post-secondary DECA advisers in Missouri's junior and community colleges. Due to the fact that some MDE instructors were also advisers, these respondents were combined into one group.

For descriptive purposes and to establish a profile of the sample, the data gathered on the Missouri sample included the following demographic information:
1. Sex
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. Employment Status
   a. Not employed
   b. Full-time (20 hours or more per week)
   c. Part-time (19 hours or less per week)

3. Student Status
   a. Full-time (12 credit hours or more)
   b. Part-time (11 credit hours or less)

4. DECA member in High School
   a. Yes
   b. No

The DECA student member, MDE instructor, and DECA adviser rosters were requested by telephone and furnished by the Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The survey instrument (Appendix A), a cover letter, and a stamped reply envelope were mailed to each individual in the three groups. A copy of the cover letter sent to DECA advisers may be found in Appendix B, while a copy of the cover letter sent to MDE instructors may be found in Appendix C. The cover letter sent to the student members of DECA may be found in Appendix D.
After a two-week interval, a second letter (Appendix E) containing another instrument was mailed to each individual who had not responded. Seven days later, a telephone call was made to the still remaining non-respondents.

The initial mailing and follow-up for students resulted in a 93 percent return. Instructors, as a group, returned 80 percent of the mailed instruments. Advisers returned 100 percent of the initially mailed instruments. The number and percent of returns for each group are described in Table 3.

Survey instruments returned provided the respondent's rating of priority for each goal statement and their rank order of importance for each of the 12 Callahan goal statements.
### Table 3

Survey results from questionnaire mailed to DECA membership, DECA advisers, and MDE instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Instruments Mailed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Number Unclaimed</th>
<th>Number Usable</th>
<th>Number of Usable Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The present chapter will report the findings of the data analyses. These results are organized into three sections. The first section will present data descriptive of the sample. The second section will present the results of the data analyses relevant to the testing of hypothesis one, and the third section will present the analyses pertinent to the testing of hypothesis two.

Description of the Sample

The sample of the study consisted of 95 student members of Missouri Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA and 37 MDE instructors/DECA advisers from six post-secondary programs, which is the total chapter membership of Missouri's Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA.

Thirty-eight (40%) of the 95 student member participants were male, and 55 (58%) of the student member participants were female. Two respondents (2%) did not provide data related to their
sex. Twenty-one (57%) of the MDE instructor/DECA adviser participants were male, and 15 (41%) of this group were female. One MDE instructor/DECA adviser did not provide data related to sex identification. These data are presented in Table 4.

With regard to employment, 35 (37%) of the student participants were employed 20 hours per week or more (full-time), and 40 (42%) were employed 19 hours per week or less (part-time). Seventeen students (18%) were unemployed, and three (3%) did not provide data related to their employment status. Table 5 presents these data.

The data regarding student members' full-time or part-time student status is found in Table 6. Of the 95 student participants, 76 (80%) were enrolled for 12 credit hours or more (full-time) and 14 (15%) were enrolled for 11 credit hours or less (part-time). One student (1%) reported zero credit hours and four (4%) did not provide data related to the number of credit hours.

As can be seen in Table 7, 17 (17%) of the student member participants had been members of High School DECA, while 76 (80%) of these participants had not been members of High School DECA. Three (3%) did not provide data related to their high school DECA membership status. With regard to the MDE instructors and DECA advisers, 11 (30%) had been members of High School DECA, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NOT REPORTED</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECA Student Members</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2 (2.11%)</td>
<td>38 (40%)</td>
<td>55 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDE Instructors/DECA Advisers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1 (2.07%)</td>
<td>21 (57%)</td>
<td>15 (43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF DECA STUDENT MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NOT REPORTED</th>
<th>20 HOURS OR MORE</th>
<th>LESS THAN 20 HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECA Student</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3 (3.16%)</td>
<td>35 (37%)</td>
<td>40 (42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NOT REPORTED</th>
<th>12 HOURS OR MORE</th>
<th>11 HOURS OR LESS OF CREDIT HRS.</th>
<th>CREDIT HRS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECA Student Members</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5 (57%)</td>
<td>76 (80%)</td>
<td>14 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUPS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NOT REPORTED</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECA Student Members</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3 (3.16%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDE Instructors/</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2 (5.04%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECA Advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24 (65%) had not held such membership. Two respondents in this group did not provide data related to High School DECA membership.

In general, most student members of Missouri Delta Epsilon Chi were full-time students employed on a part-time basis, and had not been DECA members in high school. Lack of high school DECA membership was a characteristic shared by the MDE instructor/DECA adviser group in this study.

In addition to the information reported above, all participants in this study (N=132) were asked to indicate whether or not they thought additional goals were needed. If a participant indicated in the affirmative, they were asked to provide suggested goals which they believed were needed. As can be seen in Table 8, of the entire group of Missouri participants, 128 (97%) indicated that no goals needed to be added to the National DECA goals list. One respondent added one goal, one respondent added two goals, one respondent added three goals, and one respondent added four goals. All of these additional goals were suggested by MDE instructor/DECA advisers. Their suggested goals included:

1. To develop basic math and English skills.

2. To provide opportunities for business input into curriculum development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL GOALS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>97.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. To provide for parental involvement in career planning.

4. To develop an understanding of culture.

5. To provide alternative avenues for career development.

6. To develop a better understanding of international business.

7. To prepare students for decision making.

8. To prepare students for family life.

9. To develop thinking skills.

10. To identify social problems related to business.

**Analysis of Hypothesis One**

The hypothesis of no significant difference between Missouri post-secondary DECA student member ratings of the priority of the nationally derived post-secondary DECA goals and those of the group consisting of MDE instructors/DECA advisers was tested using t-tests.

Mean ratings of priority for each goal statement were computed for each group. The mean rating for each statement by each group was examined for significance of differences. This resulted in the finding that significantly different mean priority
ratings existed for only one goal statement—the DECA goal of providing post-secondary DECA members an avenue for self-development \((t = 5.0, p < .001)\). The mean rating of priority by the student members was 2.35, while the mean MDE instructor/DECA adviser rating was 1.30. This suggests that the MDE instructor/DECA advisers considered the self-development goal as having significantly higher priority than the student members.

The mean ratings of two other goal statements closely approached being significantly different between these two groups. In order to be considered significantly different means, a t-test needs to yield a \(t = 1.96 (p < .05)\) or \(t = 2.58 (p < .01)\) when the degrees of freedom is greater than 100, as is the case in this study. The goal statement regarding the development of communication skills in business had a mean priority rating of 1.70 for the student members, and a mean priority rating of 2.0 for the MDE instructors/DECA advisers group. A t-test for the difference between these means yielded a \(t = 1.76\), indicating that student members as a group considered the priority of the communication skills goal statement to be higher than did the MDE instructor/DECA adviser group, though not quite significantly so.

The goal statement regarding the provision of an opportunity for students to manage a work program was given a mean priority
rating by students of 1.75, indicating they considered this a goal of very high priority. The MDE instructors/DECA advisers' mean priority rating for this goal was 1.49, indicating they considered this goal to be of higher priority than did the students. A t-test to determine the significance between these means yielded a t = 1.81, thereby closely approaching significance.

The student members' mean priority ratings for each statement can be found in Table 9. Also reported in this table are the number and percentage of students assigning a rating of priority to each goal statement, and the standard deviation of each goal's priority rating. As can be seen in this table, the student members as a group considered the goal of developing communication skills as having the highest priority, while the goal of developing good citizenship received the lowest priority.

The MDE instructors/DECA advisers' mean priority ratings for each goal statement can be found in Table 10. The number and percentage of MDE instructors/DECA advisers assigning priority ratings and the standard deviation of these ratings may also be found in this table. The highest mean priority rating assigned by the MDE instructor/DECA adviser group was to the goal statement regarding providing students with an opportunity for self-development. This group considered the goal of developing good citizenship as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication Skills</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Skills</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content Understanding</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Business Competencies</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Skills</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Career Identification</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Economic Understanding</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Good Citizenship</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self Development</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Occupational Performance</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Entry Level Management</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Manage Program</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTAL: 25.89 10.49

2.91 .87
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication Skills</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Skills</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content Understanding</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Business Competencies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Skills</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Career Identification</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Economic Understanding</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Good Citizenship</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self Development</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Occupational Performance</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Entry Level Management</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Manage Program</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
having the lowest priority.

A grand mean was then computed across goal statements for each group, indicating the mean priority rating assigned to the goal statements as a whole. A t-test to examine the difference between these means resulted in a $t = 4.47 (p < .01)$, as can be seen in Table 11. This indicates that students tended to assign ratings of priority significantly lower across the statements than did the MDE instructors/DECA advisers.

Thus, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Missouri post-secondary DECA student members' rating on the priority of the nationally derived post-secondary DECA goals and those of the group consisting of Missouri MDE instructors/DECA advisers is rejected by this researcher.

**Analysis of Hypothesis Two**

The hypothesis of no significant difference between Missouri post-secondary DECA student members' rankings of importance of the nationally derived post-secondary DECA goals and those of the group consisting of Missouri MDE instructor/DECA advisers was tested using a Spearman Rank Order Correlation.

Mean rankings of importance for each goal were computed for each group. These mean rankings were then rank-ordered for each group. A Spearman Rank Order Correlation was used to
TABLE 11

T-TABLE FOR DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STUDENT MEMBER RATINGS AND MDE INSTRUCTORS/DECA ADVISER RATINGS OF THE NATIONALLY DERIVED POST-SECONDARY DECA GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$X$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>122.33</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A $t$ of 3.06 or higher for an $N$ of 12 is needed for significance at the .01 level.
establish the rank order correlation coefficient of these mean rankings of importance. The rank order correlation of these rankings was $r = .91$ ($p < .01$), indicating that DECA student members' rankings of importance of the nationally derived post-secondary DECA goals had a high, significant correlation with the ranking of importance by MDE instructors/DECA advisers. These results can be found in Table 12.

As can be seen in Table 13, the two groups produced the same rank order of importance for the three goals receiving rankings indicating they were "least important". Both groups ranked the goals related to career identification, economic understanding, and good citizenship as ranking 10th, 11th, and 12th respectively. The student members and MDE instructors/DECA advisers did not agree, however, on the ranking of the "most important" goal. The student members ranked Communications Skills as the most important goal, while the MDE instructors/DECA advisers ranked the opportunity to manage a work program as the most important goal. In fact, MDE instructors/DECA advisers assigned the top three ranks to goals which were each directly work-related.

The mean ratings of priority previously established were then rank-ordered for each group, and these rank orders were compared to the rank orders of goal importance for each group.
TABLE 12

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DECA STUDENT MEMBERS RANKINGS OF THE NATIONALLY DERIVED POST-SECONDARY DECA GOALS AND MDE INSTRUCTORS/ADVISERS RANKING OF THE NATIONALLY DERIVED POST-SECONDARY DECA GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF QUESTIONS</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An r of .66 or higher for an N of 12 is needed for significance at the .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>DECA STUDENT RANKINGS</th>
<th>MDE INSTRUCTOR/DECA ADVISER RANKINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication Skills</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Skills</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content Understanding</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Business Competencies</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Skills</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Career Identification</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Economic Understanding</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Good Citizenship</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self Development</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Occupational Performance</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Entry Level Management</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Manage Program</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If "importance" and "priority" are closely related, one would expect rank orders of each to be very similar.

For the student member group, their rank ordering of importance corresponded exactly with their rank ordering of the mean priorities for the goal statements. Apparently for this group, "importance" and "priority" are closely associated concepts.

For the MDE instructors/DECA adviser group, however, their rank order of goal statement importance corresponded with the rank ordering of their goal statement priorities in only four cases. This suggests that for this group of respondents, "importance" and "priority" are not closely associated concepts.

Based upon the analysis to test hypothesis two which utilized a Spearman Rank Order Correlation producing an r = .91 (p .01), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between Missouri post-secondary DECA student members' rankings of importance of the nationally derived post-secondary DECA goals and those of the group consisting of Missouri MDE instructors/DECA advisers.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This chapter will present a summary of the findings of the study, the conclusions, and the recommendations for future study.

Marketing and distributive education is a changing field, with new developments and trends occurring during the 1980's. The new developments and trends have created educational needs for those entering the work force.

Post-secondary marketing and distributive education programs have begun to meet these challenges. One component of these programs is the student organization known as Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA), the post-secondary division being known as Delta Epsilon Chi Division. In 1979, Callahan identified 12 national goals for the post-secondary division.

In Missouri, the recent trend toward a drastic decline in post-secondary DECA student membership documents the fact that the Missouri Delta Epsilon Chi Division is not being used by potential participants to achieve the accepted DECA goals identified
by Callahan (1979). Several possible explanations are suggested by the results of this study.

First, the goals of the post-secondary DECA considered as being highest in priority by the MDE instructors/DECA advisers may not be the same goals which marketing and distributive education students believe should have the highest priority. This study shows that the two groups do not differ significantly in the priority assigned to the goal statements in all but one case. In the case of the goal regarding opportunity for self-development, the MDE instructors/DECA advisers considered the priority of this goal to be much higher than did the students. It may be that the student members believe they are already engaged in self-development activities by virtue of the fact that they are attending school and the majority of them are employed at least part-time. In such a case, the goal of self-development would be unlikely to be viewed as having high priority by the students.

The students in this study considered a goal of improving their communication skills as having highest priority. To the extent that communication skills are salient to their success in their roles as students and employees, it would be consistent that they would place highest priority on a goal of improved communication skills. They may even perceive this goal as aiding their
achievement of their self-development goals.

To the extent that MDE instructors/DECA advisers may be more supportive of those activities which they perceive as being relevant to their own highest priority goal, and to the extent that MDE instructors/DECA advisers are in a more influential position than the students in terms of being instrumental to the occurrence of Delta Epsilon Chi activities, it may be that potential student members, as well as current student members, do not view the organization as being useful to them. Hence, fewer students are joining the organization in spite of the fact that both groups consider all goals of high priority.

With regard to the two groups' rankings of importance of the goals, there was a high correlation. However, while they agreed on which goals were least important, and generally agreed on which goals were of moderate importance, they did not agree on which goal was most important. Again, the students ranked communications skills as most important. However, the MDE instructors/DECA advisers ranked the opportunity to manage a work program as the most important goal. In fact, this group as a whole assigned the top three ranks to goals which were directly related to actual work situations. Hence, students may perceive their advisory leadership as being more concerned with provision
of work-related experience rather than with skills the students
believe are relevant to their success in their work experience. In
addition, provision of work-related experiences could be expected
to be of low importance to the students since most of them are
employed at least part-time. In this respect, they may view the
goals stressed by MDE instructors/DECA advisers as irrelevant
to their needs. To the extent the organization projects this
image, potential members may not join.

Interestingly, the rank ordering of importance by the students
corresponded exactly with the rank ordering of their mean priority
ratings across goal statements, but this was not the case with the
MDE instructors/DECA advisers. To the extent importance of
goals would be helpful in establishing priorities, one would expect
consonance between these rankings. The MDE instructors/DECA
adviser group was consonant with regard to the least important
goals and those with least priority, but they were not consonant
between "most important" and "highest priority" goals. This
would suggest that the advisory leadership of local Delta Epsilon
Chi chapters may be reflecting inconsistencies or some degree of
confusion. Even though the students and MDE instructors/DECA
advisers tend to agree on overall importance of goals, the MDE
instructors/DECA advisers prioritize differently than the students
and do so in a manner inconsistent with their own rankings of importance. This, too, could help account for declining student membership.

If declining student membership in Delta Epsilon Chi is related to the fact that students and MDE instructors/DECA advisers disagree on which goal should be most important to the organization, then perhaps MDE instructors/DECA advisers need to be made aware of student beliefs regarding this. Then, perhaps, adjustments could be made to make the primary goal of the organization one which students will find relevant to their needs.

Finally, the DECA goals are those which could be attributed to any vocational education program, not necessarily a student organization. The inconsonance between the two groups regarding goals may speak to more consequential concerns regarding educational programs.

Recommendations

The finding that rankings of importance are not always consonant with priorities assigned may constitute a problem due to potential lack of clarity of meaning of goals. It may be that use of Krathwohl's level one for goal statements may be too broad to consistently permit prioritization that is consonant with importance rankings. This level may be too general to be similarly meaningful
to both groups, thereby creating disagreements and potential confusion. It is suggested that goal statements or additional goals might be more fruitfully expressed by using Krathwohl's level two, which is more concrete, in order to increase the meaningfulness of the concepts.

Another recommendation is that a study be conducted to investigate how a non-DECA member sample affiliated with the post-secondary MDE programs would rate and rank priority and importance of the official 12 goals. Such a study would help to provide a broader view of the issues raised or addressed in this study. Consideration should also be given for a study to be conducted to investigate how a national sample affiliated with Delta Epsilon Chi Division would rate and rank the 12 goals.

This investigation was conducted to add to the body of knowledge related to DECA goals on the post-secondary level. The study was restricted to deal with a particular problem related to a specific population. It is hoped that the results of this study can be utilized by the participant group, as well as by marketing and distributive education personnel, to gain insight into possible problems associated with declining student interest in DECA. It may also be helpful in determining the possibility of investigating other factors such as student interest and objectives, enrollment status, and program commitment.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
INSTRUCTIONS: The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine if the goals of Missouri Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA are the same as the goals of the National Junior Collegiate Division of DECA as established by a 1979 study conducted by Dr. Eugene R. Callahan at Auburn University. These twelve goals are listed, and you are being asked to rate each goal within the range of Extremely High Priority, High Priority, Medium Priority, Low Priority, Extremely Low Priority, or Do Not Include. You are also requested to give each goal a ranking from 1-12 indicating how important you believe the goal is with 1 being "most important" and 12 being "least important." Indicate your choice by placing a number in the box to the left of the goal statement that indicates your ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>GOAL STATEMENT</th>
<th>Extremely High Priority</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Extremely Low Priority</th>
<th>Do Not Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To develop communication skills required in business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>To develop leadership skills as they apply to business activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>To develop an understanding of marketing, management, and merchandising as a part of the free enterprise system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>To develop identified business competencies through interaction with business leaders representing the various areas of marketing and distribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>To develop social skills required in business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To provide Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA members an avenue for career identification and development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>To provide Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA members an avenue for development of economic understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>To provide Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA members an avenue for understanding the responsibilities of citizenship in the United States.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>To provide Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA members an avenue for self-development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>To challenge Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA members to think, create, learn, and manage in the areas of their occupational interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>To prepare students to function in entry-level supervisory and management assignments or positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>To provide opportunities for students to plan, organize, direct and control a program of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would appreciate it if you will complete the following information which will be used to target concerns or problems now being experienced by the post-secondary Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA.

Are there additional goals to be added? _____ YES _____ NO If YES please list. __________________________

________________________ __________________________

Are you: _____ Male _____ Female
Are you a/an: _____ Student _____ Instructor _____ Chapter Advisor _____ Instructor & Advisor
Are you presently working 20 hours or more per week? _____ YES _____ NO
Are you presently working 19 hours or less per week? _____ YES _____ NO
Are you taking 12 credit hours or more this semester? _____ YES _____ NO
Are you taking 11 credit hours or less this semester? _____ YES _____ NO
Did you belong to DECA in high school? _____ YES _____ NO
APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO CHAPTER ADVISER
January 31, 1984

Dear Chapter Adviser:

You are being invited to participate in a study, as a Chapter Adviser, to determine Missouri's post-secondary Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) goals. Philosophically, DECA has been one of the important components in Marketing/Management (MDE) curricula by providing leadership opportunities and professional development.

Historically, Missouri post-secondary DECA, as well as the nation as a whole, experienced a steady growth in membership numbers from 1967 through 1975. Although Missouri's Community College enrollments and vocationally-reimbursed Marketing/Management courses are experiencing increased enrollments, membership and participation in post-secondary DECA are declining. In 1981-1982, there were 171 DECA Delta Epsilon Chi Division members in six chapters. In 1983-1984, there were only 102 members.

Dr. Eugene Callahan conducted a doctoral study (1979) at Auburn University to identify the goals for the post-secondary division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America. The study formulated a list of goals and enabling objectives to encourage growth and provide direction to the post-secondary division of DECA. As part of my doctoral program at The Ohio State University, I intend to determine if Missouri post-secondary DECA goals are congruent with the DECA goals identified by the Callahan study.

This study can serve as a basis to determine if post-secondary DECA is serving today's Marketing/Management students, and if it is relevant for future students, including community college populations. Additionally, it could place emphasis on the Missouri Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA.

As a Chapter Adviser, I believe you will want to participate in this study that will provide creditable, relevant data for future statistical evaluation of post-secondary DECA. I would like to ask that you administer a questionnaire to your post-secondary DECA student members. The student roster furnished by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, DECA adviser, contains only your school address for the student members.

Sincerely,

J. Patrick Tritt
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER TO MDE INSTRUCTORS
January 31, 1984

Dear Marketing/Management Instructor:

You are being invited to participate in a study, as a vocationally reimbursed instructor of Marketing and Distributive Education and mid-management, to determine Missouri's post-secondary Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) goals. Philosophically, DECA has been one of the important components in Marketing/Management (MDE) curricula by providing leadership opportunities and professional development.

Historically, Missouri post-secondary DECA, as well as the nation as a whole, experienced a steady growth in membership numbers from 1967 through 1975. Although Missouri's Community College enrollments and vocationally-reimbursed Marketing/Management courses are experiencing increased enrollments, membership and participation in post-secondary DECA are declining. In 1981-1982, there were 171 DECA Delta Epsilon Chi Division members in six chapters. In 1983-1984, there were only 102 members.

Dr. Eugene Callahan conducted a doctoral study (1979) at Auburn University to identify the goals for the post-secondary division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America. The study formulated a list of goals and enabling objectives to encourage growth and provide direction to the post-secondary division of DECA. As part of my doctoral program at The Ohio State University, I intend to determine if Missouri post-secondary DECA goals are congruent with the DECA goals identified by the Callahan study.

This study can serve as a basis to determine if post-secondary DECA is serving today's Marketing/Management students, and if it is relevant for future students, including community college populations. Additionally, it could place emphasis on the Missouri Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA.

I am enclosing related study information as well as a survey instrument to be completed by you. Please return this survey instrument as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

J. Patrick Tritt

Enclosure
APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER TO DELTA EPSILON CHI MEMBERS
Dear Delta Epsilon Chi Member:

You are being invited to participate in a study as a Delta Epsilon Chi member. Philosophically, DECA has been one of three important components in Marketing/Management curricula by providing leadership opportunities and professional development.

Historically, Missouri post-secondary DECA, as well as the nation as a whole, experienced a steady growth in membership numbers from 1967 through 1975. Although Missouri's Community College enrollments and vocationally-reimbursed Marketing/Management courses are experiencing increased enrollments, membership and participation in post-secondary DECA are declining. In 1981-1982, there were 171 DECA (Delta Epsilon Chi Division) members in six chapters. In 1983-1984, there were only 102 members.

Dr. Eugene Callahan conducted a doctoral study (1979) at Auburn University to identify the goals for the post-secondary division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America. The study formulated a list of goals and enabling objectives to encourage growth and provide direction to the post-secondary division of DECA. As part of my doctoral program at The Ohio State University, I intend to determine if Missouri post-secondary DECA goals are congruent with the DECA goals identified by the Callahan study.

This study can serve as a basis to determine if post-secondary DECA is serving today's Marketing/Management students and if it is relevant for future students, including the community college populations.

Your cooperation in doing this study is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. Patrick Tritt
APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER
February 16, 1984

Dear

Recently, you received a letter inviting you to participate in a post-secondary DECA related study being conducted in Missouri.

If you have not had the time to respond to the survey, I would like to encourage you to do so as soon as you can. I would appreciate your support. Your input is very valuable and it does offer you the opportunity to help make some decisions concerning the direction of Delta Epsilon Chi Division of DECA in the future.

Thank you for your time and support.

Sincerely,

J. Patrick Tritt

J. Patrick Tritt
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