

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

---

5-1973

## A Comparison of Selected Characteristics of Two-Year Office Administration and Four-Year Business Education Students at Utah State University

Moneice S. G. Stocker  
*Utah State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports>



Part of the [Business Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Stocker, Moneice S. G., "A Comparison of Selected Characteristics of Two-Year Office Administration and Four-Year Business Education Students at Utah State University" (1973). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 714.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/714>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Plan B and other Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



A COMPARISON OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF TWO-YEAR OFFICE  
ADMINISTRATION AND FOUR-YEAR BUSINESS EDUCATION  
STUDENTS AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

by

Moneice S. G. Stocker

A report submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Business Education

Plan B

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Logan, Utah

1973

98.2  
5162c  
v.2

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is deeply appreciative to Dr. Harold R. Wallace, major professor, for his assistance, encouragement, and recommendations. A special thanks is expressed to the other two committee members-- Dr. Lloyd Bartholome and Dr. B. Orson Tew.

For the assistance of H. Robert Stocker, the writer is also grateful.

Moneice Stocker

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	11
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
CHAPTERS	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	2
Need for the Study . . . . .	3
Delimitations. . . . .	3
Limitations. . . . .	4
Methods and Procedures . . . . .	4
Definition of Terms. . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	6
Introduction . . . . .	6
Summary . . . . .	12
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	13
Subjects . . . . .	13
Questionnaire . . . . .	13
Pilot Study . . . . .	14
Administration of Questionnaire. . . . .	15
IV. FINDINGS	
Academic Ability Self-Concept . . . . .	17
Vocational Ability Self-Concept . . . . .	19
Socio-Economic Status . . . . .	20
High School Grade Point Average . . . . .	21
College Grade Point Average . . . . .	22
Demographic Information . . . . .	23
Summary . . . . .	23
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	24
Summary . . . . .	24
Conclusions. . . . .	25
Recommendations. . . . .	26

LITERATURE CITED . . . . .	28
----------------------------	----

# APPENDIXES

A. Age Distribution of Two-Year Office Administration Students. . . . .	32
B. Age Distribution of Four-Year Business Education Students . . . . .	33
C. Sex and Marital Status of Two-Year Office Administration Students. . . . .	34
D. Sex and Marital Status of Four-Year Business Education Students . . . . .	35
E. Cover Letter . . . . .	36
F. Questionnaire . . . . .	37
G. Two-Year Office Administration Individual Scores Used in Study . . . . .	43
H. Four-Year Business Education Individual Scores Used in Study . . . . .	46
VITA . . . . .	48

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	Page
1. Comparison of Academic Ability Self-Concept . . . . .	18
2. Comparison of Vocational Ability Self-Concept . . . . .	19
3. Comparison of Socio-Economic Status . . . . .	20
4. Comparison of High School Grade Point Average . . . . .	21
5. Comparison of College Grade Point Average . . . . .	22

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Much has been researched and written about school curriculum. A number of recent articles have focused attention on the student as an individual learner (Edmund, 1970) and away from "content" emphasis temporarily spurred by the advent of the Russian Sputnik (Cremin, 1961). Virtually every subject in the curriculum has been considered. The overall concern has been the improvement of student learning (Woolf, 1972). Efforts have also been made to increase the relevancy of learning.

. . . curriculum designers have thought about relevance . . . They have been struggling with a general effort to design curriculum that make sense to the students who spend weeks and months in the classroom and laboratories of American schools. The concern for relevance is partially as effort to combat the meaninglessness of schooling so eloquently expressed by dropouts--both among the talented and the not-so-talented. (Oliverio, 1970, p. 35)

The designing and implementing of a curriculum is difficult. Groundwork must be done if a curriculum is to provide a student with the opportunity to be considered an individual learner.

The Department of Business Education and Office Administration at Utah State University has been involved in the redesign of its curriculum. During Winter Quarter, 1972, the department studied:

1. The employment situation for the occupations for which it prepares students;
2. The current and anticipated supply and demand for office workers;

3. The office worker labor market trends; and
4. The characteristics of past and present students in its programs.

The department is attempting to revise its offerings in accordance with the findings of various pertinent studies and to justify present curriculum offerings in view of those findings. When the departmental study is concluded, the teacher education program, the four-year office administration program and the two-year program in office administration will be redesigned. This investigation is concerned with one aspect of the total curriculum redevelopment effort.

#### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to compare selected characteristics of two-year Office Administration students with four-year Business Education students in the Department of Business Education and Office Administration at Utah State University. The students were registered during the academic year 1971-72.

Specifically, an attempt was made to answer the following questions:

1. Does the Academic Ability Self-Concept of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the Academic Ability Self-Concept of the four-year Business Education student?
2. Does the Vocational Ability Self-Concept of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the Vocational Ability Self-Concept of the four-year Business Education student?
3. Does the Socio-Economic Status of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the Socio-Economic Status of the



four-year Business Education student?

4. Does the High School Grade Point Average of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the High School Grade Point Average of the four-year Business Education student?

5. Does the College Grade Point Average of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the College Grade Point Average of the four-year Business Education student?

#### Need for the Study

According to Department of Business Education records, a majority of students who register for a program offered by the Department of Business Education and Office Administration initially prefer a two-year Office Administration program. A number of these students, however change this objective to a four-year business Education objective during their first two years in school.

No comparison has been made to determine whether the characteristics of students who change from a two-year Office Administration program to a four-year Business Education program differ from the characteristics of those students who originally had as their objective a four-year program in Business Education. Nor has there been a comparison of the characteristics of students who indicate a preference for a two-year Office Administration program with the characteristics of students who indicate a preference for a four-year Business Education program.

This study is an attempt to fill the need for a comparison of the four-year Business Education students' characteristics with those characteristics of the two-year Office Administration students.

#### Delimitations

This study has been delimited to the two-year Office Administration

and four-year Business Education students registered in the Department of Business Education and Office Administration during the academic year 1971-72. However, there are students enrolled in a four-year Office Administration program and who have aspirations for gaining a four-year degree. While this study is not concerned with this group of students, there are likely differences between two-year and four-year Office Administration students which could be investigated in another study.

### Limitations

No attempt was made after the administration of the questionnaire to determine which students change their objective from a four-year Business Education program to a two-year Office Administration program or from a two-year Office Administration program to a four-year Business Education program.

No specific follow-up was conducted to determine if the entire population of this study had been surveyed although an attempt was made to survey the entire population.

### Methods and Procedures

The study was conducted in the Department of Business Education and Office Administration at Utah State University during Winter Quarter of the 1971-72 academic year. Students registered in the department during that quarter were subjects for the study.

The questionnaire was designed to measure selected student characteristics and was administered to the subjects of the study. The completed questionnaires were separated into two groups, those indicating

a preference for a two-year Office Administration program and those indicating a preference for a four-year Business Education program.

A separate recording chart was used to tabulate the responses for each major heading of the questionnaire. Each individual response was recorded in an appropriate space and was later combined with other like responses to develop totals for each category. A t-test was applied to determine if differences in the responses of the two groups were significant.

### Definition of Terms

Academic Ability Self-Concept - The evaluation a person makes of himself with regard to the ability to achieve in academic tasks in general, especially as compared with others. (AASC)

Vocational Ability Self-Concept - An evaluation a person makes of himself with regard to his ability to achieve in occupational tasks as compared with others. (VASC)

Socio-Economic Status - A measure of the father's (or head of the household) occupational level as measured by the Duncan Index. (SES)

High School Grade Point Average - Grade point average for all high schools attended, based on a 4.0 system. (H.S. GPA)

College Grade Point Average - Grade point for the student at time questionnaire was administered, based on a 4.0 system. (Coll. GPA)

Demographic Characteristics - Personal information about the student, such as marital status, age, and sex.

## CHAPTER II

### Review of Literature

#### Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present evidence concerning the effect of a student's self-concept on his achievement. The evidence will be in accord with the overall purpose of the study which is to compare selected characteristics of two-year Office Administration and four-year Business Education students.

The evidence will be identified by authors of studies relating to achievement and self-concept.

Hamachek. Educators and psychologists are becoming more and more aware of the fact that a student's own concept of himself is closely connected to how he behaves and learns. "Many students for example, have difficulty in school, not because of low intelligence, or bad hearing but because they have learned to consider themselves unable to do academic work." (Hamachek, 1971, p. 174)

. . . each person, whether conscious of it or not, carries about with him a mental blueprint or picture of himself. It may be vague and ill-defined, but it is there, complete down to the last detail. The blueprint is composed of a system of interrelated ideas, attitudes, values and commitments which are influenced by our past experiences, our successes and failures, our humiliations, our triumphs, and the way other people reacted to us, especially during our formative years. Eventually, each person arrives at a more or less stable framework of beliefs about himself and proceeds to live in as consistent a manner as possible within that framework. In short, an individual "acts like" the sort of person he conceives himself to be. Indeed, it is extremely difficult to act

otherwise, in spite of a strong conscious effort and exercise of will power. The boy, for example, who conceives himself to be a "failure-type student" can find all sorts of excuses to avoid studying, doing homework, or participating in class. Frequently, he ends up with the low grade he predicted he would get in the first place. His report card bears him out. Now he has "proof" it seldom occurs to a person that his trouble lies in his own evaluation of himself . . . Once a student "locks in" on a perception of what he is or is not able to do, it is difficult to shake him from it, particularly if the perception has time to root itself into a firmly established belief. (Hamachek, 1970, pp. 175-6)

Thus, students' "inferior" opinions affect not only school achievement but also goal setting because they set lower goals for themselves.

Mahone. Mahone (1960) found that a person who has a low estimate of himself is strongly motivated to avoid failure and tends to set goals so low that he does not need to prove himself. On the other hand, Mahone found that people high in self acceptance are willing to prove themselves.

Lecky. Prescott Lecky (1945) in a study relating self-consistency to school performance was one of the first to point out that low academic achievement may be related to a student's conception of himself as being unable to learn academic material. He observed that some children made the same number of errors in spelling per page no matter how difficult or easy the material. It occurred to Lecky that the children were responding more in terms of how they thought they could spell than in terms of their actual spelling abilities. As a result of this, Lecky had a group of the children spend some time with the counselor who helped them explore their feelings about their spelling abilities. As a consequence of their discussions and despite

the fact that these children had not been given additional work in spelling, there was a notable improvement in their spelling. As they acquired new consistencies; and their performances changed in the direction of being consistent with the new perception.

Garvey. Garvey (1970), in trying to predict successes of student teachers, concluded from other investigations as well as his own that "self-concept is . . . the most important single influence affecting an individual's behavior."

Brookover. From several other studies, Brookover (1959) proposed that while innate factors may set limits on learning ability, one other factor may functionally limit the learning ability of many students and prevent them from working at their maximum level. This factor is the student's self-concept of his ability as a school learner.

Combs. Combs (1964) conducted a study among high school boys and determined that academically capable but under-achieving high school boys saw themselves as less adequate and less acceptable than did the students who had made a more successful adjustment to the scholastic situation.

Combs and Snygg; Mead. Research on the perceptual approach to individual behavior conducted by Combs and Snygg (1959) and research by Mead (1934), who was concerned with symbolic interaction, have essentially the same findings. They both hypothesized that a child learns what he perceives he is able to learn, and that this self-perception comes from interaction with associates who hold expectations for the student as a learner.

Hamachek. Further Hamachek says:

A student perceives, interprets, accepts, resists or rejects what he encounters at school in the light of the

way he sees himself as a person generally and as a student specifically. There is a mounting body of evidence to suggest that a student's performance in an academic setting is influenced in both subtle and obvious ways by his concept of self. (Hamachek, 1971, p. 184)

McPartland, Cumming, and Garretson; Miyamoto and Dornbusch;  
Brookover, Thomas, and Patterson; Brookover, Patterson, and Thomas.

Previous research has established the relationship between self-concept and behavior (McPartland, Cumming, and Garretson, 1961) and between self-concept and perceived evaluations of significant others (Miyamoto and Dornbusch, 1960). Specifically, recent research has indicated that there is a relationship between self-concept of ability in school and academic performance as well as between self-concept of ability and perceived evaluations by others (Brookover, Thomas, and Patterson, 1964). In addition it has been demonstrated that there is a relationship between perceived evaluations by significant others and academic performance (Brookover, Patterson, and Thomas, 1962).

Rezaglia; Reeder. Rezaglia (1952) and Reeder (1955) examined correlates of self-structure and found that a positive general self-concept is significantly related to high academic achievement.

Williams and Cole. A 1968 study undertaken by Williams and Cole was concerned with the relationships between self-concept and school adjustment among eighty sixth-grade students. They found a positive relationship between self-concept and emotional adjustment. It was determined that students who saw themselves in a positive light were also likely to be emotionally well adjusted and were more likely to enjoy high social status among their peers than were the lower self-concept students.

Roth. In task-oriented situations there is some evidence that the students' performance is influenced directly by their self-concepts (Roth, 1959). For example, in investigating the role of self-concept in achievement, Roth concluded:

. . . in terms of their conception of self, individuals have a definite investment to perform as they do. With all things being equal, those who do not achieve, choose not to do so, while those who do achieve, choose to do so. (Roth, 1959, p. 265-281)

Lipsitt. Lipsitt (1958) conducted a study designed to compare the relation between self-rejection or negative self-concept and measures of anxiety. He found that boys and girls with poor self-concepts were more anxious than were boys and girls with good self-concepts.

McCandless, Castaneda, and Palermo; Castaneda, Palermo, and McCandless; McCandless and Castaneda. Other research has shown that high-anxious children, when compared to low-anxiety children, are less popular (McCandless, Castaneda, and Palermo, 1956); have greater difficulty with conceptually complex learning tasks (Castaneda, Palermo, and McCandless, 1956); and in at least some cases do less well in the more complicated school subjects (McCandless and Castaneda, 1956).

Dittes. Experimental evidence (Dittes, 1959) indicated that low-esteem persons, when faced with anxiety-provoking situations, are inclined to make hasty, impulsive judgments. On the other hand, high self-esteem persons when faced with anxiety-provoking situations (at least as judged by an outside observer) are more deliberate and careful in making judgments.

Videbeck. Videbeck (1960) found that the students' self-conceptions are learned and that the evaluative reactions of others play



a significant part in learning.

Nash. In a study involving junior high school students, Nash (1964) developed a set of one hundred items which included three dimensions of self-perceptions assumed to be important. Interestingly, the items which were found to be best in differentiating between high- and low-achievers were those concerned with the student's perception of the quality of his performance in school work.

Dyson. In an investigation by Dyson (1967) dealing with the relationships between self-concept and ability grouping among seventh graders, it was found that high-achieving students reported significantly higher self-concepts than did low-achieving students, regardless of the type of grouping procedures used. Dyson's final observations were:

If there is one particularly significant result growing out of this research, it is that "nothing succeeds like success." This is not a new understanding, as the old cliché indicates. The work reported here does, however, re-emphasize the importance of success in the learning situation as a contribution to positive psychological growth and it indicates that this feeling of success is probably more crucial in its effect on the student self-concept than how an individual is grouped for instruction. (Dyson, 1967, pp. 403-405)

Clarke. In a study which examined the relationships between college academic performance and expectancies, Clarke (1960) found a positive relationship between a student's academic performance and his perception of the academic expectancies held for him by significant others.

Staines; DeGroot and Thompson. Teachers have an influence on the self-concept of students and can alter that self-concept by making positive comments to them as well as creating an atmosphere of greater psychological security (Staines, 1956). Another example is the research

of DeGroot and Thompson (1949) who found that teachers give more praise to brighter, better adjusted, and higher achieving students. Less capable students were observed by these investigators to receive more disapproval from their teachers.

Helper. Helper's 1960 study found a positive correlation between parental evaluations of their children and the children's self evaluations, thus adding to the evidence that self appraisals reflect the appraisals of significant others.

### Summary

The above studies share the common idea that the student's self-concept can affect his performance, behavior, and aspirations. These studies also present evidence to support the idea that changes in levels of performance or in behavior have a direct relation to changes in self-concept. Some of these studies also suggest that people significant or important to the students can have a profound influence upon the students' concepts of themselves.

### CHAPTER III

#### Methods and Procedures

##### Subjects

The subjects for this study were 88 two-year Office Administration students and 66 four-year Business Education students. They were registered in the Department of Business Education and Office Administration during Winter Quarter of the 1971-72 academic year.

The majority of these students in both groups were single and female (see Appendix C and Appendix D). Their ages (see Appendix A and Appendix B) were either 18 (most common for two-year Office Administration students) or 19 (most common for four-year Business Education students).

##### Questionnaire

The major source of information for this study was a questionnaire distributed to students. The study was conducted in the Department of Business Education and Office Administration at Utah State University during Winter Quarter of the 1971-72 academic year. The classes surveyed were: one section of BE 241, Office Data Systems; two section of BE 201, Office Practice; three sections of BE 112, Intermediate Typewriting; two sections of BE 113, Advanced Typewriting; one section of BE 124, Dictation and Transcription; two sections of BE 121, Beginning Shorthand; one section of BE 122, Intermediate Shorthand; and one section of BE 123, Advanced Shorthand. An effort was made to select classes

with the largest number of Business Education and Office Administration students; and, at the same time, try to reduce the number of possible duplications among students taking the questionnaire.

Two classes, BE 131, Business Machines; and BE 351, Business Communications, were not included in the survey because of the large number of Accounting and Business Administration students enrolled in each of these classes.

The questionnaire was designed by two graduate students, one of which was the writer, and two faculty members, as part of a departmental study. Information used in the design of this questionnaire was obtained from a similar research project, Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement (1967) published in three separate parts and completed at Michigan State University at East Lansing, Michigan. Also the doctoral studies of Dr. Edward L. Houghton (1971) and Dr. William D. Woolf (1972) were used as models both for items to be included in the questionnaire and for methods of displaying the comparison information.

The questionnaire (see Appendix F) was designed to measure certain student characteristics. This study dealt only with the following characteristics: (1) Academic Ability Self-Concept, (2) Vocational Ability Self-Concept, (3) Socio-Economic Status, (4) High School Grade Point Average, and (5) College Grade Point Average. The demographic information was used only to identify the subjects and was not part of the comparisons.

#### Pilot Study

To test the effectiveness of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted using the faculty members of the Business Education and Office Administration Department as subjects. The faculty members

were asked to respond to the questions and to offer constructive criticism. From the information obtained during the pilot study, several questions were revised, some were eliminated and others added. The questionnaire was then prepared for use in the departmental survey.

#### Administration of the Questionnaire

A cover letter was included with the questionnaire, describing the effort being made by the Department of Business Education and Office Administration to upgrade the offerings to meet the present and future needs of the students. (See Appendix E.)

All instructors were cooperative, and each was given enough questionnaires for the number of students enrolled in his classes.

The questionnaires were administered during regular class time. Each student was given approximately twenty minutes to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaires were then collected by the instructors.

The completed questionnaires were separated into two groups, those indicating a preference for a two-year Office Administration program and those indicating a preference for a four-year Business Education program. Incomplete questionnaires were disregarded, as were those of students who had indicated a major field of study other than Office Administration or Business Education. Only questionnaires completed by the two-year Office Administration students or by the four-year Business Education students were used in this investigation.

A separate chart was used to tabulate the responses for each

major portion of the questionnaire. Each individual response was recorded to produce totals for each category. A t-test was applied to determine significance of differences between groups.

## CHAPTER IV

### Findings

The purpose of this paper was to compare selected characteristics of those students registered in either a two-year Office Administration program or a four-year Business Education program in the Department of Business Education and Office Administration at Utah State University. Consideration was given the following characteristics: (1) Academic Ability Self-Concept, (2) Vocational Ability Self-Concept, (3) Socio-Economic Status, (4) High School Grade Point Average, and (5) College Grade Point Average.

#### Academic Ability Self-Concept

The data for this section of the study were taken from section 7 of the questionnaire (see Appendix F).

The measuring instrument used in this section was the Michigan State General Self-Concept of Ability Scale. This instrument was prepared by Brookover (1967) and consists of a list of five-choice items developed from a pretest (see Appendix F). Items were coded from five to one with the higher self-concept alternatives receiving the higher values. Thus, the higher numbers indicate higher self-concepts.

Only two sections of the instrument were utilized in this study. These sections were: (1) Self-Concept of Academic Ability-General,

and, (2) Self-Concept of Vocational Ability-General. (See Appendix G and Appendix H for a list of all scores used in this chapter.)

Table 1 is a summary of the data obtained from this comparison.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC ABILITY SELF-CONCEPT

	Two-Year OA	Four-Year BE
N	88	66
$\Sigma X$	1839	1428
$\bar{X}$	20.897	21.313
$\Sigma X^2$	39567	31492

The t-test was used to determine whether a significant difference existed at the .05 level of significance between the groups.

A t of  $-.756$  resulted. Since  $-.756$  is less than the tabled value of  $1.960$ , it was found that no significant difference existed in Academic Ability Self-Concept between students in the two-year Office Administration program and students in the four-year Business Education program.



### Vocational Ability Self-Concept

The data for this section of the study were taken from section 6 of the questionnaire (see Appendix F).

The Michigan State General Self-Concept of Ability Scale was the instrument used to measure this data. (See Appendix G and Appendix H for all scores used in this chapter.)

Table 2 is a summary of the data obtained from this comparison.

TABLE 2  
COMPARISON OF VOCATIONAL ABILITY SELF-CONCEPT

	Two-Year OA	Four-Year BE
N	88	66
$\Sigma X$	2829	2124
$\bar{X}$	32.147	31.701
$\Sigma X^2$	90231	69187

The t-test was used to determine whether a significant difference existed at the .05 level of significance between the groups.

A t of 3.147 resulted. Since 3.147 is more than the tabled value of 1.960, it was found that two-year Office Administration students scored significantly higher in Vocational Ability Self-Concept than did the students in the four-year Business Education program. The result seems to bear out the fact that two-year Office Administration students have a more firmly fixed vocational self-concept than do four-year Business Education students.

### Socio-Economic Status

The data for this section of the study were taken from section 4 of the questionnaire (see Appendix F).

The Duncan Index (1961) was used to determine the socio-economic status. This index was based on the interrelationships of three factors: (1) income, (2) education, and (3) occupation. It was prepared by the National Opinion Research Center for its study of the 1950 labor market to predict the prestige ratings of occupations.

Table 3 is a summary of the data obtained from this comparison.

TABLE 3

#### COMPARISON OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

	Two-Year OA	Four-Year BE
N	88	66
$\Sigma X$	3958	2537
$\bar{X}$	44.977	38.439
$\Sigma X^2$	23126	13756

The t-test was used to determine whether a significant difference existed at the .05 level of significance between the groups.

A t of 7.602 resulted. Since 7.602 is more than the tabled value of 1.960, it was found that a significant difference existed in Socio-Economic Status between students in the survey, with the two-year Office Administration students scoring significantly higher than the four-year Business Education students.

### High School Grade Point Average

The data for this section of the study were taken from section 2 of the questionnaire (see Appendix F).

The High School Grade Point Average was determined by an average of all grades received during high school. It was based on a 4.0 system with an A valued at 4.0, B valued at 3.0, C valued at 2.0, and D valued at 1.0.

Table 4 is a summary of the data obtained from this comparison.

TABLE 4

#### COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADE POINT AVERAGE

	Two-Year OA	Four-Year BE
N	86	64
$\Sigma X$	281	213.8
$\bar{X}$	3.267	3.340
$\Sigma X^2$	933.98	727.84

The t-test was used to determine whether a significant difference existed at the .05 level of significance between the groups.

A t of .095 resulted. Since .095 is less than the tabled value of 1.960, it was found that no significant difference existed in High School Grade Point Average between students in the two-year Office Administration program and students in the four-year Business Education program.

### College Grade Point Average

The data for this section of the study were taken from section 2 of the questionnaire (see Appendix F).

The College Grade Point Average was determined by an average of all grades received in college up to the time the questionnaire was administered. It was based on a 4.0 system with an A valued at 4.0, B valued at 3.0, C valued at 2.0, and D valued at 1.0.

Table 5 is a summary of the data obtained from this comparison.

TABLE 5

#### COMPARISON OF COLLEGE GRADE POINT AVERAGE

	Two-Year OA	Four-Year BE
N	86	65
$\Sigma X$	256.6	195.9
$\bar{X}$	2.984	3.014
$\Sigma X^2$	786.30	604.97

The t-test was used to determine whether a significant difference existed at the .05 level of significance between the groups.

A t of .042 resulted. Since .042 is less than the tabled value of 1.960, it was found that no significant difference existed in College Grade Point Average between students in the two-year Office Administration program and students in the four-year Business Education program.

### Demographic Information

The vast majority (see Appendix C and Appendix D) of both two-year Office Administration and four-year Business Education students were single and female. There was a slightly greater number of single females aged 18 registered as two-year Office Administration students than four-year Business Education students. The age most common for four-year Business Education students was 19 (see Appendix A and Appendix B).

### Summary

No significant difference was found to exist between the two-year Office Administration students and the four-year Business Education students in Academic Ability Self-Concept, High School Grade Point Average, and College Grade Point Average.

A significant difference was found to exist between the two-year Office Administration students and the four-year Business Education students in Vocational Ability Self-Concept and Socio-Economic Status. In both cases, the two-year Office Administration students were found to be higher.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

This study was a comparison of selected characteristics of two-year Office Administration and four-year Business Education students registered in the Department of Business and Office Administration during Winter Quarter of academic year 1971-72.

Findings of this study were produced in response to the following questions:

1. Does the Academic Ability Self-Concept of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the Academic Ability Self-Concept of the four-year Business Education student?

2. Does the Vocational Ability Self-Concept of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the Vocational Ability Self-Concept of the four-year Business Education student?

3. Does the Socio-Economic Status of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the Socio-Economic Status of the four-year Business Education student?

4. Does the High School Grade Point Average of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the High School Grade Point Average of the four-year Business Education student?

5. Does the College Grade Point Average of the two-year Office Administration student differ from the College Grade Point Average of the four-year Business Education student?

A questionnaire was developed in a Department of Business Education and Office Administration curriculum study. These questionnaires were administered to two-year Office Administration and four-year Business Education students during Winter Quarter of the 1971-72 academic year. Only sections, or portions of sections 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 were used to elicit data for this study (see Appendix F).

Recording charts were kept of all information obtained from these specific sections of the questionnaire. The information obtained from these recording charts was used in the data analysis.

The t-tests were applied to determine if significant differences existed between two-year Office Administration and four-year Business Education students. The .05 level of significance was used.

### Conclusions

As a result of this study the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Students enrolled in a two-year Office Administration program have an Academic Ability Self-Concept which does not differ significantly from those students enrolled in the four-year Business Education program.
2. Students enrolled in a two-year Office Administration program have a Vocational Ability Self-Concept which is significantly higher than those students enrolled in the four-year Business Education program.
3. Students enrolled in a two-year Office Administration program have a Socio-Economic Status which is significantly higher than students enrolled in the four-year Business Education program.
4. Students enrolled in a two-year Office Administration program have a High School Grade Point Average which does not differ significantly from those students enrolled in the four-year Business Education program.

5. Students enrolled in a two-year Office Administration program have a College Grade Point Average which does not differ significantly from those students enrolled in the four-year Business Education program.

The two-year Office Administration students scored significantly higher in Vocational Ability Self-Concept and Socio-Economic Status.

#### Recommendations

Based on the results of this study the following recommendations seem pertinent:

1. Further research should be conducted on students enrolled in different programs to obtain knowledge of student characteristics which can provide insight for curriculum development. Of particular interest would be a comparison study, similar to this study, between two-year and four-year Office Administration students.

2. Further study should be made of the relationships of Academic Ability Self-Concept, Vocational Ability Self-Concept, and Socio-Economic Status to student achievement in the programs of the Department of Business Education and Office Administration.

3. Further study should be made of the relationship of High School Grade Point Average to achievement in the Department of Business Education and Office Administration.

4. Additional work should be done in the area of student characteristics. Instead of relying so much on psychological variables, relationships to known academic variables should be established and new ways to relating student characteristics to success should be developed.



### Implications

Perhaps one reason the two-year students' higher vocational self-concepts would be the fact that these students will be placed in a vocation two years sooner than will the four-year Business Education students.

The higher socio-economic status (meaning a more educated and affluent head of the household) for the two-year Office Administration students may indicate that they are not so concerned with the social rank as are students who's parents are not so well off. A large portion of Utah State University's population comes from farms and rural communities. These students seem more concerned with establishing themselves in vocations that offer security as well as financial rewards. Thus more of these rural students seem interested in a "dual" vocation-- they can either work in an office, as can the two-year Office Administration students, or they can become educators, which the Office Administration students are not qualified to do. However, there are several rural students in the two-year Office Administration program as well.

Also there could be some credence to the idea that students from the rural areas have sometimes had a closer relationship with their parents on a daily basis as they have worked together for the family's welfare. In this relationship, parents could have instilled in the children (students) a desire for a higher educational degree than that of the parents, thus seeking for their children opportunities which they had not been educationally prepared for. Many farmers share their time and interests between farming and teaching school.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Brookover, Wilbur B. 1959. "A Social Psychological Conception of Classroom Learning." School and Society, 87:84-87.
- Brookover, Wilbur B., Edsel L. Erickson, and Lee M. Joiner. 1967. "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement III." Final Report on Cooperative Research Project No. 2831. U.S. Office of Education, East Lansing: Human Learning Research Institute, Michigan State University, p. 249.
- Brookover, Wilbur B., Ann Patterson, and Shailer Thomas. 1962. "The Relationship of Self-Images to Achievement in Junior High School Subjects." Final Report of Cooperative Research Project No. 845. Educational Publication Services, College of Education, Michigan State University, pp. 2-3.
- Brookover, Wilbur B., Ann Patterson, and Shailer Thomas. 1962. "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement." Final Report of Cooperative Research Project No. 845. U.S. Office of Education East Lansing: Bureau of Research and Publications, College of Education, Michigan State University.
- Brookover, Wilbur B., Shailer Thomas, and Ann Patterson. 1964. "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement." Sociology of Education, 37:271-278.
- Castaneda, A., D. S. Palermo, and B. R. McCandless. 1956. "Complex Learning and Performance as a Function of Anxiety in Children and Task Difficulty." Child Development, 27:237-332.
- Clarke, W. E. 1960. "The Relationship Between College Academic Performance and Expectations." Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Michigan State University. (Original not seen; cited in Brookover, et. al.)
- Combs, Arthur W. and Donald Snygg. 1959. Individual Behavior, Revised Edition. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Combs, Charles F. 1964. "Self-Perception and Scholastic Underachievement in the Academically Capable." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 43:47-51.
- Cremin, Laurence A. 1961. The Transformation of the School. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, p. 347.

- DeGroot, A. F. and G. G. Thompson. 1949. "A Study of the Distribution of Teacher Approval and Disapproval Among Sixth Grade Pupils." Journal of Experimental Education, 18:51-75.
- Dittes, J. C. 1959. "Effects of Changes in Self-Esteem Upon Impulsiveness and Deliberation in Making Judgments." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58:348-356.
- Duncan, O. D. 1961. "A Socio-Economic Index for All Occupations" in Occupations and Social Status, ed. A. J. Reiss. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, pp. 109-161.
- Dyson, Ernest. 1967. "A Study of Ability Grouping and the Self-Concept." The Journal of Educational Research, 60:403-405.
- Edmund, Gordon. 1970. "Introduction" to American Educational Research Association. Review of Educational Research: Education for Socially Disadvantaged Children, 40:11.
- Garvey, Reba. 1970. "Self-Concept and Success in Student Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education, 21:357.
- Hamachek, Don E. 1971. Encounters With the Self. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Helper, M. M. 1960. "Parental Evaluations of Children and Children's Self-Evaluations." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56:190-194.
- Houghton, Edward L. 1971. "A Follow-Up Study of the Business Graduates Southern Oregon College 1964-1969." Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oregon. Unpublished Doctor's Thesis.
- Lecky, Prescott. 1945. Self-Consistency--A Theory of Personality. New York: Island Press.
- Lipsitt, L. P. 1958. "A Self-Concept Scale for Children and It's Relationship to the Children's Form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale." Child Development, 29:463-472.
- Mahone, G. H. 1960. "Fear of Failure and Unrealistic Vocational Aspirations." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60:253-261.
- McCandless, B. R. and A. Castaneda. 1956. "Anxiety in Children, School Achievement, and Intelligence." Child Development, 27:379-382.
- McCandless, B. R., A. Castaneda, and D. S. Palermo. 1956. "Anxiety in Children and Social Status." Child Development, 27:385-392.

- McPartland, Thomas S., John H. Cumming, and Wynona Garretson. 1961. "Self-Conception and Ward Behavior in Two Psychiatric Hospitals." Sociometry, 25:11-124.
- Mead, George H. 1934. Mind, Self and Society. University of Chicago Press.
- Miyamoto, Frank and Stanford Dornbusch. 1956. "A Test of the Interactionist Hypothesis of Self-Conception." American Journal of Sociology, 61:399-403.
- Nash, Ralph J. 1964. "A Study of Particular Self-Perceptions as Related to High School Age Pupils in a Middle Class Community." Dissertation Abstracts, 14:3837-3838.
- Oliverio, Mary Ellen. 1970. "The Changing School Curriculum." National Business Education Association Yearbook Number Eight, Washington, D. C., 8:31-39.
- Reeder, Thelma Adams. 1955. "A Study of Some Relationships Between Levels of Self-Concept, Academic Achievement, and Classroom Adjustment." Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Denton: North Texas State College. (Original not seen; cited in Brookover, et. al.)
- Roth, R. M. 1959. "Role of Self-Concept in Achievement." Journal of Experimental Education, 27:265-281.
- Staines, J. W. 1956. "Self-Picture as a Factor in the Classroom." British Journal of Educational Psychology, 28:97-111.
- Videbeck, Richard. 1960. "Self-Conception and the Reaction of Others." Sociometry, 23:351-359.
- Williams, Robert L. and S. Cole. 1968. "Self-Concept and School Adjustment." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47:478-481.
- Woolf, William D. 1972. "A Comparison of Selected Self-Concepts and Other Characteristics of Secondary Students Enrolled in Utah Senior Vocational and Non-Vocational Classes." Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Michigan State University.

## APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX A

## AGE DISTRIBUTION

OF TWO-YEAR OFFICE ADMINISTRATION STUDENTS

(69 Reporting Age)

Age	Number
18	28
19	21
20	7
21	6
22	4
24	1
25	1
27	1

## APPENDIX B

AGE DISTRIBUTION  
OF FOUR-YEAR BUSINESS EDUCATION STUDENTS  
(50 Reporting Age)

Age	Number
18	12
19	17
20	13
21	5
22	1
24	1
26	1

## APPENDIX C

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS  
OF TWO-YEAR OFFICE ADMINISTRATION STUDENTS  
(88 Reporting)

	Female	Male
Single	81	0
Married	5	1
Other*	2	0

\*Widow(er) or divorced



## APPENDIX D

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS  
OF FOUR-YEAR BUSINESS EDUCATION STUDENTS  
(64 Reporting)

	Female	Male
Single	56	1
Married	8	0
Other*	0	1

\*Widow(er) or divorced

## APPENDIX E

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Department of Business Education  
Curriculum Study

The department of Business Education at Utah State University is involved in major program revision. Future students will participate in more relevant and interesting educational experiences if the instructional content is geared to the needs of our former and present students. Your sincere and honest response will be of great help in assuring that future students and their employees will be better served.

All of the information you provide will be treated with strict confidence. Please answer all the questions fully and completely. There are no "wrong" or "right" answers. Please give careful thought to each response so that your answers will be as accurate as you can make them.

Thank you

APPENDIX F  
(Questionnaire)

## PERSONAL DATA

\_\_\_\_\_ Single \_\_\_\_\_ Married \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female

## EDUCATIONAL DATA

High schools attended \_\_\_\_\_  
 School City State School City State

What was your major academic interest in high school?

What business courses did you take while in high school?

High school grade point average: \_\_\_\_\_

What is your college major: \_\_\_\_\_

As a student you are a part-time student \_\_\_\_\_, full-time student \_\_\_\_\_

This quarter you are a: Freshman \_\_\_\_\_, Soph. \_\_\_\_\_, Jr. \_\_\_\_\_, Sr. \_\_\_\_\_

What is your college grade point average? \_\_\_\_\_

Check one alternative in column A and one in column B to indicate your plans.

Academic Plans (A)

Employment Plans (B)

I plan to stay in school to complete a

☐ Work in an office

bachelor's degree in:

☐ work in distribution

☐ Office Administration

☐ To teach

☐ Business Education (teaching)

☐ Undecided

☐ Distributive Education (teaching)

☐ Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ I am planning a one year or two year program

☐ I am planning on a four year degree

☐ Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Undecided

I am not planning a four-year degree because: \_\_\_\_\_

## ABOUT MYSELF

Which THREE of the following have influenced you MOST in the selection of your college program: (Indicate your selections by placing the number 1 for first choice, 2 for second choice, and 3 for third choice.)

☐ my spouse (if married)

☐ my parents

☐ my brothers or sisters

☐ other relatives or adults

☐ a business teacher

☐ a guidance counselor

☐ my friends

☐ the news media (radio, television, newspapers, etc.)

☐ no one (I have made my own decisions)

☐ circumstances (grades, attendance record, lack of interest, etc.)

☐ other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Which THREE of the following have influenced you MOST in the selection of your occupational career: (Indicate your selections by placing the number 1 for first choice, 2 for second choice, and 3 for third choice.)

☐ my spouse (if married)

☐ my parents

☐ my brothers or sisters

☐ other relatives or adults

☐ a Business teacher

☐ a guidance counselor

☐ my friends

☐ the news media (radio, television, newspapers, etc.)

☐ no one (I have made my own decisions)

☐ circumstances (grades, attendance record, lack of interest, etc.)

☐ other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

ou are unmarried and being supported by father, mother, uncle, foster parents, or older person answer question 12.  
 ou are unmarried and self-supporting go directly to question 13.  
 ou are married and are supporting a spouse or being supported by a spouse go directly to question 14.

The person who supports me:

- ☐ is working  
☐ is unemployed

This person's occupational title is \_\_\_\_\_.

This person performs the following job tasks, duties, or responsibilities \_\_\_\_\_

I am currently:

- ☐ working  
☐ unemployed

My occupational title is \_\_\_\_\_

I perform the following job tasks, duties, or responsibilities \_\_\_\_\_

My spouse (or self if you are the breadwinner) is: (circle spouse or self)

- ☐ working  
☐ unemployed

The occupational title is \_\_\_\_\_

What are the main tasks, duties, or responsibilities performed by my spouse (or myself)? \_\_\_\_\_

As to my knowledge of the work I intend to enter: (Check those which are applicable).

- ☐ I have good knowledge because I have worked at it.  
☐ I have good knowledge because I have relatives or friends who work at it.  
☐ I have a general knowledge, but don't know much about the details of it.  
☐ I don't know much about it yet, but will find out by experience on the job.  
☐ I don't know much about it yet, but will find out when I go on to school.  
☐ I don't know because I have not yet made a choice.

In the occupation I have chosen I can expect help in getting started:

- ☐ from my father or mother who is in this type of work  
☐ from relatives who are in this type of work  
☐ from friends who are in this type of work  
☐ from no one  
☐ I don't know because I have not made my choice yet

In your choice of college major your father and mother have:

- ☐ tried to encourage you  
☐ neither tried to encourage or discourage you  
☐ tried to discourage you

My father's occupation is \_\_\_\_\_; and he considers his occupation to be:

- ☐ completely satisfactory ☐ not very good  
☐ fairly satisfactory ☐ very poor  
☐ good enough

My mother considers my father's occupation to be:

- ☐ completely satisfactory ☐ not very good  
☐ fairly satisfactory ☐ very poor  
☐ good enough

My father thinks that the education he obtained is:

- ☐ completely satisfactory ☐ not very good  
☐ fairly satisfactory ☐ very poor  
☐ good enough

My parents are considered by most people in the community to be:

- ☐ very important people  
☐ rather important people  
☐ just average people  
☐ of less than average importance  
☐ not at all important

As to continuing my education beyond high school, my father:

- ( ) has strongly encouraged me to continue  
 ( ) has given me some encouragement to continue  
 ( ) has never said much about it  
 ( ) he feels that I would be better off going to work after high school  
 ( ) he feels that I should quit school and go to work

As to continuing my education beyond high school, my mother:

- ( ) has strongly encouraged me to continue  
 ( ) has given me some encouragement to continue  
 ( ) has never said much about it  
 ( ) feels that I would be better off going to work after high school  
 ( ) feels that I should quit school and go to work

As to the kind of job I go into, my father/or husband:

- ( ) wants me to have a very important job  
 ( ) wants me to have a job that is quite a bit better than most jobs  
 ( ) wants me to have a job that is a little bit better than most jobs  
 ( ) feels that the job I take should be as good as most jobs  
 ( ) Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

As to the kind of job I go into, my mother/or wife:

- ( ) wants me to have a very important job  
 ( ) wants me to have a job that is quite a bit better than most jobs  
 ( ) wants me to have a job that is a little bit better than most jobs  
 ( ) feels that the job I take should be as good as most jobs  
 ( ) does not care how good the job I go into is  
 ( ) Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

#### OUT MY CHOICE OF A LIFE'S OCCUPATION

The occupations which I have thought about going into are:

1. First choice: \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Third choice: \_\_\_\_\_  
 2. Second choice: \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Fourth choice: \_\_\_\_\_

The occupation I plan to follow is: \_\_\_\_\_

In regard to my choice of my occupation:

- ( ) I feel sure that my mind is made up  
 ( ) I'm not too sure, but I think my mind is made up  
 ( ) I'm not sure that my mind is made up

In regard to my choice of an occupation:

- ( ) I have given the matter a great deal of thought  
 ( ) I have given the matter some thought  
 ( ) I have given the matter little thought

In general, people consider FIVE facts when they choose a job. (Indicate your selections by placing the number 1 for first choice, 2 for second choice, 3 for third choice, 4 for fourth choice, and 5 for fifth choice.)

- \_\_\_\_\_ The money you can make  
 \_\_\_\_\_ The difficulty in getting the required education  
 \_\_\_\_\_ The working hours  
 \_\_\_\_\_ The good you can do  
 \_\_\_\_\_ The social standing of the occupation  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Factors) \_\_\_\_\_

If I were absolutely free to go into the kind of work I wanted, my choice would be: \_\_\_\_\_

The type of work I would like to be doing when I am 30 years old is: \_\_\_\_\_

The type of work I will likely be doing when I am 30 years old is: \_\_\_\_\_

# CONCEPT OF VOCATIONAL ABILITY

Do you think you have the ability to do any job you desire?

- ☐ yes, definitely
- ☐ yes, probably
- ☐ not sure either way
- ☐ no, probably not
- ☐ no, definitely not

How do you rate yourself in your ability to do a job you would want to do in comparison to your classmates who have similar interests?

- ☐ I am among the best
- ☐ I am above the average
- ☐ I am average
- ☐ I am below average
- ☐ I am the poorest

Where do you think you would rank in your ability to do your favorite job?

- ☐ Among the best
- ☐ Above average
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Below average
- ☐ Among the poorest

Do you feel you have the academic ability to complete training necessary in the occupation of your greatest interest?

- ☐ yes, definitely
- ☐ yes, probably
- ☐ uncertain
- ☐ no, probably not
- ☐ no, definitely not

In your opinion how good do you think your work will be in the occupation you might choose?

- ☐ my work would be very good
- ☐ my work would be above average
- ☐ my work would be average
- ☐ my work would be below average
- ☐ my work would be rather poor

After 5 years of working in the job of your greatest interest where do you think you will rank in comparison with others who have held the same job for 5 years?

- ☐ among the best
- ☐ above average
- ☐ average
- ☐ below average
- ☐ among the lowest

Compared to others your age, how would you rate yourself in knowledge of the job of your greatest interest?

- ☐ I have complete knowledge
- ☐ I have more knowledge than most
- ☐ about the same as others
- ☐ less than others
- ☐ almost none

If there are NO limitations on occupational choice or advancement, within an occupation of your interest, how do you rate your chances for promotion based upon quality of work?

- ☐ among the best
- ☐ above average
- ☐ average
- ☐ below average
- ☐ among the poorest

## NCEPT OF ACADEMIC ABILITIES

How do you rate yourself in school ability compared with a close friend?

- ☐ I am much better
- ☐ I am somewhat better
- ☐ we are equal
- ☐ my friend is somewhat better
- ☐ my friend is much better

How do you rate yourself in school ability compared with those in your class at college?

- ☐ I am among the best
- ☐ I am above average
- ☐ I am average
- ☐ I am below average
- ☐ I am among the poorest

Where do you think you would rank in your class in college?

- ☐ I am among the best
- ☐ I am above average
- ☐ I am average
- ☐ I am below average
- ☐ I am among the poorest

Do you think you have the ability to complete a graduate college program?

- ☐ yes, definitely
- ☐ yes, probably
- ☐ not sure either way
- ☐ probably not
- ☐ no

Where do you think you would rank in your class at graduate school?

- ☐ among the best
- ☐ above average
- ☐ average
- ☐ below average
- ☐ among the poorest

Forget for a moment how others grade your work. In your own opinion how good do YOU think your work is?

- ☐ my work is excellent
- ☐ my work is good
- ☐ my work is average
- ☐ my work is below average
- ☐ my work is much below average



## APPENDIX G

TWO-YEAR OFFICE ADMINISTRATION  
INDIVIDUAL SCORES USED IN STUDY

---



---

Student	SES	VASC	AASC	H.S GPA	Coll. GPA
1	84	35	26	4.0	3.9
2	84	34	24	3.8	3.2
3	22	27	19	3.9	2.8
4	34	34	19	3.0	2.5
5	47	26	22	3.2	2.8
6	47	37	22	3.7	2.7
7	50	34	14	2.5	2.5
8	60	32	20	2.0	2.0
9	60	34	24	3.8	3.4
10	60	34	21	3.0	2.6
11	60	32	23	4.0	3.7
12	61	35	23	3.0	3.3
13	72	32	21	3.8	3.2
14	84	31	19	3.0	2.5
15	45	38	25	3.7	3.4
16	19	31	26	3.5	3.2
17	19	33	23	3.2	3.0
18	15	28	18	3.0	2.9
19	14	34	22	3.3	3.2
20	14	30	20	3.0	2.0
21	85	31	21	3.8	3.0
22	12	38	25	3.2	3.4
23	14	31	19	3.8	4.0
24	65	30	22	3.3	3.0
25	54	32	20	3.0	2.8
26	72	29	18	2.5	2.5
27	49	36	27	3.0	3.0
28	54	29	18	2.8	2.3
29	29	36	23	3.6	3.5
30	25	31	19	-	-
31	72	30	9	2.7	-
32	36	32	21	3.0	-
33	26	34	17	3.8	3.0
34	84	37	20	3.4	3.1
35	79	32	21	2.5	3.0
36	24	32	20	3.8	3.5
37	77	30	19	3.0	2.8
38	34	36	21	3.9	3.6
39	59	26	23	3.9	3.5

## APPENDIX G Continued

Student	SES	VASC	AASC	H.S. GPA	Coll. GPA
40	27	27	18	3.0	2.8
41	14	36	23	3.5	3.6
42	15	33	20	3.5	3.0
43	14	36	25	3.0	3.0
44	84	29	17	3.5	3.5
45	49	28	20	3.2	3.9
46	72	26	21	2.5	2.4
47	65	33	21	3.2	2.5
48	25	32	20	3.7	3.2
49	8	34	24	3.5	2.7
50	49	32	19	2.8	2.5
51	85	31	19	3.0	2.7
52	25	32	23	3.8	3.5
53	25	29	19	3.5	3.0
54	37	34	21	3.0	2.8
55	79	36	26	3.7	2.9
56	14	29	18	3.5	2.7
57	24	32	18	-	-
58	48	33	24	3.8	3.2
59	19	30	20	3.0	-
60	58	30	19	3.8	2.5
61	82	31	17	3.0	2.8
62	60	28	19	3.4	3.7
63	47	36	22	3.5	2.5
64	33	28	22	3.7	3.5
65	14	31	20	3.7	3.5
66	62	33	22	3.2	3.4
67	14	34	22	3.6	3.0
68	48	33	24	3.0	3.0
69	40	27	19	3.5	3.0
70	14	32	22	3.5	3.0
71	14	31	7	3.0	4.0
72	72	35	20	2.9	3.3
73	78	38	28	3.5	3.7
74	44	33	25	4.0	4.0
75	25	32	25	3.7	3.8
76	49	30	20	3.4	2.5
77	70	34	21	3.2	2.5
78	61	31	22	3.7	4.0
79	15	31	20	3.0	2.5
80	14	34	26	3.6	3.5
81	72	37	26	3.9	3.8
82	18	32	22	3.1	2.6

## APPENDIX G Continued

Student	SES	VASC	AASC	H.S. G <sup>1</sup> A	Coll. G <sup>1</sup> A
83	96	32	20	2.9	2.8
84	14	23	17	3.0	3.0
85	31	29	23	3.5	3.3
86	31	39	26	3.7	3.4
87	31	40	25	3.0	-
88	72	30	18	3.0	2.0
Mean	44	32	20	3.2	2.9

## APPENDIX H

## FOUR-YEAR BUSINESS EDUCATION

## INDIVIDUAL SCORES USED IN STUDY

Student	SES	VASC	AASC	H.S. GPA	Coll. GPA
1	76	32	21	2.5	3.0
2	72	34	21	3.0	3.0
3	72	35	24	3.9	3.0
4	72	31	22	3.7	3.5
5	68	30	22	3.8	3.8
6	14	31	21	3.9	3.1
7	14	28	19	2.5	2.0
8	14	29	18	3.4	2.7
9	14	35	23	3.3	2.8
10	85	36	26	3.8	3.2
11	44	29	17	3.0	3.0
12	39	34	20	3.0	2.0
13	39	28	17	2.7	2.6
14	36	31	22	3.5	3.0
15	29	37	23	3.8	3.9
16	28	35	30	2.8	2.5
17	27	34	25	3.9	3.0
18	27	28	21	3.8	3.7
19	24	33	20	3.3	3.4
20	24	27	21	2.9	2.5
21	22	37	24	3.7	3.6
22	22	34	24	3.9	3.5
23	19	38	24	3.5	4.0
24	19	38	24	3.6	3.4
25	19	30	18	3.5	2.5
26	85	35	25	3.8	3.6
27	85	32	19	3.7	3.0
28	84	38	23	3.9	2.5
29	84	26	16	3.0	2.3
30	79	32	28	3.6	3.6
31	78	26	18	3.0	2.9
32	14	37	21	3.0	2.8
33	14	31	21	3.2	3.0
34	14	33	16	3.0	-
35	14	31	24	3.7	3.4
36	14	37	26	3.8	2.8
37	14	36	26	3.0	2.5
38	14	32	22	3.4	3.3
39	14	30	20	3.5	3.2
40	14	25	20	3.5	2.8

## APPENDIX H Continued

Student	SES	VASC	AASC	H.S. GPA	Coll. GPA
41	14	35	21	2.5	2.7
42	14	30	20	3.8	3.8
43	14	32	20	3.6	3.5
44	14	36	21	3.6	3.2
45	14	32	24	3.8	3.4
46	14	31	21	2.8	2.5
47	68	34	25	3.7	3.1
48	68	31	20	3.3	2.7
49	61	37	26	3.9	3.6
50	60	33	23	3.2	3.3
51	60	27	16	3.0	3.0
52	56	30	20	3.5	3.5
53	53	33	20	3.2	2.7
54	51	30	20	3.9	-
55	50	34	25	3.0	2.5
56	47	29	17	2.0	2.5
57	46	36	28	3.9	3.3
58	44	31	21	3.5	3.3
59	19	27	20	3.8	2.8
60	19	35	26	3.7	3.7
61	19	29	20	3.4	3.6
62	19	31	19	3.5	-
63	19	39	28	4.0	3.6
64	19	29	21	2.5	2.9
65	18	28	24	3.8	3.5
66	14	30	20	3.6	2.7
Mean	38	31	21	3.3	3.0

VITA

Moneice S. G. Stocker

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Plan B: A Comparison of Selected Characteristics of Two-Year  
Office Administration and Four-Year Business Education  
Students at Utah State University

Major Field: Business Education

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Richfield, Utah, March 1, 1944,  
daughter of Alton D. and Olive Lewis Sudweeks; married  
H. Robert Stocker; two children--Stanley David and  
Nicole Gottfredson.

Education: Attended elementary school in Junction, Utah and  
Circleville, Utah; graduated from Piute High School in  
Junction, Utah in 1962; received the Bachelor of Science  
degree from Utah State University, with a composite major  
in Business Education, in 1971; completed requirements for  
Master of Science degree at Utah State University in 1973.

Professional Experience: Instructor in Vocational Improvement  
Program (part of Manpower Development and Training Act)  
from August, 1971 to November, 1971; EPDA Fellow for  
academic year 1971-72; intern instructor as part of fellow-  
ship at Utah State University during Spring Quarter, 1972.