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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One aim of education is to provide a curriculum that will give practical experience needed to fulfill the goals of the student. Nolan, Hayden, and Malsbary have stated this goal as follows: "The curriculum must be kept up-to-date in order to provide students with the best opportunity to develop those knowledges, skills, attitudes, and understandings needed to gain entrance into and succeed in the business world."¹ A program in the broad field of Vocational Education which is trying to meet the needs of the student is Distributive Education. The keynote in Distributive Education (D.E.) is expressed as, "We train them now for a career, not just a one-subject class but a total curriculum tailored to the students' future needs in a well-rounded career."² In order to provide youth with this career preparation, more than traditional classroom work must be provided. One way in which Distributive Education is providing its youth with a link to reality is the cooperative method. When participating in the cooperative method, the student gains competencies in his career goal by taking instruction, part in the classroom and part in the business community.


The success of cooperative distributive education can be directly attributed to the ability of the teacher-coordinator to plan and conduct a wide range of coordination activities associated with classroom activities. To assure the teacher-coordinator of success in planning and conducting a wide range of coordination activities in cooperative distributive education, state and national guidelines have been made available. These guidelines are functional, showing the teacher-coordinator how to carry out the many activities needed to complete the cooperative program. Among the activities identified as essential to the cooperative program, is that of selecting training stations and training sponsors of the program. The responsibility of the teacher-coordinator is to place the right distributive education student in the right distributive education job. The main concern of this investigation is to determine the extent that the distributive education teacher-coordinators of Utah are meeting the responsibilities of proper utilization of the business community.

Statement Of The Problem

The purpose of this investigation is to determine the degree to which the distributive coordinators, in the secondary schools of Utah, are following accepted guidelines in the development of training stations and training sponsors. The accepted guidelines are interpreted as those recommendations specified in the D.E. Coordinators Handbook For Utah, prepared by William D. Woolf, and The Guide For Cooperative Vocational Education prepared by the University of Minnesota.


Specifically, this study will:

1. Determine what dimensions of the state and national guidelines are utilized by Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators in the selection of training stations and training sponsors.

2. Determine what dimensions of the state and national guidelines are not utilized by Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators in the selection of training stations and training sponsors.

3. Give recommendations for improvements in the selection of training stations and training sponsors to the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators' practices in those areas where they depart from the State Handbook and National Guideline.

Need For The Study

The National Business Education Association states, "...a supervised cooperative work experience program in distributive education is especially desirable."\(^5\) It should be clear, however, that there is nothing automatic or guaranteed regarding the results of a cooperative program. Only those programs following suggested practices have an opportunity to meet the occupational competencies. The program must function according to the suggested standards established throughout the nation and published as guidelines for the coordinators of Utah. These guidelines express the criteria and responsibilities which are essential in the development of training stations and training sponsors if coordinators are going to meet the goals of youth. It is vital that the training station and training sponsor provide the competencies to make the youth employable in his career choice.

\(^5\)National Business Education Association, Policy Commission, This We Believe, (1961).
The training station and training sponsor provide the actual work experience which the student needs to reach his career goal. The teacher-coordinator provides relevant learning experiences to achieve the competencies needed in the classroom. The success of the cooperative program is dependent on both factors, actual work experience and classroom teaching, to acquire a practical education to meet the demands of the business community.

It is believed that many distributive education teacher-coordinators have weaknesses in the utilization of the development of effective training stations and training sponsors. Harris is concerned with the weakness as, "The population (size of town) of the school district where the teacher-coordinator was employed had a significant effect on the category of selection of training stations and placement activities." Other weaknesses common to training stations' and training sponsors' development suggested by Tonne, Popham, and Freeman, are: "Businessmen are not always willing to cooperate, and some school administrators do not like the variation from the regular program."

**Definition of Terms**

**Distributive Education**

Identifies a program of instruction to serve the educational needs of students within the framework of their career goals, whether they are

---


preparing themselves for job entry, career development, or specialization in the area of distribution. 8

Cooperative Program

Describes the relationship between the school and the employing business, both of which work together to prepare a student for his vocation in distribution. 9

State and National Guidelines

 Identifies the recommended practices and procedures teacher-coordinators should follow for a successful program in meeting the career goals of youth.

Training Station

 Identifies the employing business which gives practical experience of actual work to prepare a student for his career goal.

Training Sponsor

 Identifies the individual within the employing business which prepares the actual work needed to prepare the student for his career goal.

Assumptions

The following assumptions are made as a basis for the investigation:

1. Certain criteria should be used by the distributive education teacher-coordinators in the selection of training stations and training sponsors, to offer a relevant learning experience which the student would not otherwise receive from a total classroom program in preparing him for

---

8 Nolan, Hayden, and Malsbary, Principles and Problems, p. 252.

a career goal in the field of distribution.

Limitations

The following limitations may be of importance to the outcome of this investigation:

1. The researcher has not had past experience as a distributive education coordinator.
2. The researcher cannot control the bias of each distributive education teacher-coordinator.
3. This survey was conducted by means of a questionnaire which prevented additional questions being added during the completion by the distributive education teacher-coordinators.

Delimitations

The following delimitations for conducting this investigation about the development of training stations and training sponsors are:

1. The teacher-coordinators used in this survey are taken exclusively from the State of Utah.
2. This survey deals with the selection of training stations and training sponsors.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section is a review of state and national guidelines, and authorities' criteria for the development and selection of training stations and training sponsors. Raines expresses:

A student has the firm conviction that participation in a cooperative program will equip him with the skills necessary for success in business or industry. ... The fulfillment of the objectives of the student are the responsibility of the teacher-coordinator selecting a satisfactory training station and training sponsor.10

To help meet this objective, it is clear that the teacher-coordinator must use certain criteria in the selection of training stations and training sponsors. This suggested criteria is incorporated in the subtitles of this chapter. In particular, this chapter and study will be organized around eleven headings:

1. Selection of the Training Station
2. Reputation and Competency of the Training Station and Training Sponsor
3. Placement of the Student
4. Providing a Learning Experience for the Student
5. Hours of Work Per Week
6. Job Rotation

7. Evaluating Progress of the Student
8. Job Adjustment Problems
9. Coordination Time Given For Visiting The Training Station
10. Coordinating Requirements Demand Extended Contracts
11. Coordinating Other Vocational Cooperative Programs

Background Information On The National Guideline and Utah Handbook

Each of these headings convey a qualitative dimension of the total cooperative program. Any cooperative program can be judged on how well it meets this criteria. The criteria relates to the development of training stations and training sponsors and are taken from the National Guideline and Utah Handbook.

The National Guideline is the product of the deliberations of several groups of people having responsibilities for cooperative education. The first was about 200 people who attended a national conference on cooperative vocational education held in Minneapolis on February 26-28, 1969. This group of selected participants represented business, industry, labor, education, government and community interests from across the nation. The purpose was to bring together people with a wide range of backgrounds to focus on the extension and improvement of cooperative vocational education. The National Conference participants were divided into ten task forces which were led by outstanding vocational educators, half of whom were from locations other than the Upper Midwest. All participants and staff were informed and stimulated by six exceptionally able speakers who were followed by symposium members speaking on selected aspects of the morning or afternoon topic as the case might be. Each of the National Conference task force leaders presented a prepared summary paper at one of the nine regional clinics held in April. This leader and a member of the contract staff met with the discussion groups following the presentation for the purpose of identifying regional concerns and to answer questions about the National Conference proceedings and findings. Recorders were selected and their notes became part of the source material for this guide. The task force leaders met in Minneapolis on May 12 to make recommendations for this final document. They reacted to a tentative content outline prepared by members of the contract staff and gave suggestions on the treatment and format of the content material.11

---

The Utah handbook follows standards recommended by authorities in the nation. It provides a ready reference that gives ideas about "how to do" in order to successfully carry out the various activities of the Distributive Cooperative Program.

The handbook provides the new teacher with specific suggestions so that he can effectively operate a distributive program, and helps the teacher in the field with a reference check to his operational procedures and policies.

**Selection of the Training Station**

The National Guideline, Utah Handbook, and Harris suggest that the selection of the specific training station be the responsibility of the distributive education teacher-coordinators. The National Guideline and Utah Handbook also suggest that the advisory committee, school administrators, and the student be valuable resources in identifying suitable training stations. If the student has found a job before entering the distributive education cooperative program, it becomes the responsibility of the teacher-coordinator to visit the employer to see if he will be willing to participate in the program so a meaningful learning experience can be obtained.

---


Reputation and Competency of the Training Sponsor and Training Station

The community will tend to evaluate the distributive education cooperative program partly on the type of firm or organizations which participate. Therefore, it is important to consider the reputation, (ethical business practice) and competency, (businessman skills and technical aspects of the occupation) of the employing firm. The National Guideline states:

The policies and practices of the potential training stations should be such that the community will approve of their participation in the program. The community will be critical if the participating firms do not have a good reputation. It is essential that the training stations provide training sponsors who are competent in their occupations...

The Utah Handbook, Crawford, and Mason support the National Guideline by stating the importance of the training station having a good reputation and the training sponsor being competent in the skills and technical aspects of the occupation.

Placement of the Student

The placement of the student on-the-job will come after the distributive education teacher-coordinator has selected the training station by considering its reputation and competency of the training sponsor. The selection of a specific training station for the student is the responsibility of the teacher-coordinator.

18 Guide, p. 66.
The National Guideline indicates:

The distributive education teacher-coordinator match the characteristics of the student to the training station which will contribute to the vocational development of the student; the training sponsor having final selection in the hiring of the student.22

The Utah Handbook suggests, "...sending a qualified student for an interview and the training sponsor having the final say of hiring the student."23 Harris agrees that the placement of cooperative part-time students can best be accomplished by, "The coordinator selecting several suitable students to apply; final selection should then be left to the discretion of the business firm personnel."24

Providing A Learning Experience for the Student

An important element to the success of the distributive education cooperative program is for the teacher-coordinator to give special help to the training sponsor in how to train the student toward his career goal. To meet this objective of providing a learning experience, the National Guideline suggests:

The management and the employees in potential training stations should be committed to the training objectives and be willing to plan appropriate training and instruction for the students. The training sponsor has the ability to organize and conduct job instruction training. The training sponsor has the willingness to work with the school coordinator in planning instruction.25

The purpose of planning, organizing, and regulating on-the-job learning experiences is to match the capabilities of the student for

24 Harris, Requirements For Teacher-Coordinators, p. 76.
some students may take a long time to learn a relatively simple job while other students are capable of learning highly skilled jobs and assuming increasing responsibilities.\textsuperscript{26} The Utah Handbook,\textsuperscript{27} and Samson,\textsuperscript{28} suggest the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor should work jointly on all matters regarding the student supervision and training toward reaching his objective.

**Hours of Work Per Week**

Every state has child labor laws which apply to student learners in cooperative distributive education programs. The authorities in distributive education are in agreement with the child labor laws and believe that a 15-hour work week will meet the requirements of providing the student with a learning experience which will make him employable toward his career goal.

In reference to the child labor laws on hours of work per week, the National Guideline suggests:

In general, the hours of work permitted at certificate rates plus the hours of school instruction, (not including study hall, home room, and activity periods with no academic credit) may not exceed 40-hours a week. If a school is not in session, such hours of employment training may not exceed 8 a day or 40 a week.\textsuperscript{29}

The Utah Handbook supports the National Guideline by stating,

"There should be a sufficient number of working hours at the training

---

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., p. 60.

\textsuperscript{27}Woolf, Handbook For Utah, p. III-9.


\textsuperscript{29}Guide, p. 76.
station. (A 15-hour week is preferred.) Harris, and Mason also suggest that the student be employed a minimum of 15-hours per week throughout the school year.

**Job Rotation**

To meet the career interest of the student, the training station should provide training for occupations that are challenging and worthy of the student's time and effort during the 15-hours per week that a student works throughout the year. The National Guideline states it this way:

A general plan for the job rotation and sequencing school instruction will serve as a guide in correlating on-the-job training and classroom learning. The employer and training sponsor should be able to specify the learning experiences which lead to occupational competence. However, the coordinator may have to provide checklists or a general outline of possible on-the-job experiences. The sequence of learning experiences should show some progression from the simple to the complex.

The Utah Handbook in supporting the above states, "...give the student consideration by choosing a training station that offers a truly educational experience for him and by striving to adjust the job experience to his needs, interests, and abilities."
Samson, Harris, and Mason also believe that the distributive education teacher-coordinator should develop training stations which are susceptible to promotion and advancement for the student.

Evaluating Progress of the Student

One purpose of evaluating the progress of the student is to insure a purposeful learning, so that the student may use this learning experience to secure worthwhile employment when he completes high school. The National Guideline recommends, "Proficiency tests to be used in some occupations, however, in the absence of appropriate measures of objectives, a rating sheet be used...along with the formal test and observation of the student on-the-job."38

The Utah Handbook agrees, stating, "The distributive education coordinator and training sponsor should also make informal evaluations from time to time."39 (They should discuss.) Samson,40 and Ashmun,41 also suggest that the progress of the student be periodically evaluated by the distributive education teacher-coordinator and training sponsor.

---


38 Guide, p. 73.


Job Adjustment Problems

One purpose of the distributive education cooperative program is to help the student adjust from an academic world to a practical world of work. The student may encounter various problems at his training station and to help make a satisfactory adjustment, the National Guideline suggests, "The training sponsor and distributive education teacher-coordinator discuss the problems which a student might be having and work to solve that problem." 42

The Utah Handbook agrees, stating, "If major problems arise at the training station regarding the student, the employer should contact the teacher-coordinator immediately." 43 Harris, 44 and Samson, 45 have also agreed with both the National and State Guidelines on the matter of solving student on-the-job problems.

Coordination Time Given For Visiting The Training Station

Once the qualified student is placed in his proper training station, the distributive education teacher-coordinator should visit the on-the-job training station to assure that it is contributing to the development of occupational competence of the student. To meet the objective of a purposeful learning, the National Guideline, 46 Utah

---

42 Guide, p. 68.
44 Harris, "Requirements and Judgment Comparisons," p. 17.
Handbook, Samson, and Harris recommend that the distributive education teacher-coordinator be given one-half hour per week, per student, of coordination time to visit the training station, and assure that it is contributing to the development of the occupational competence of the student.

Coordinating Requirements Demand Extended Contracts

The distributive education teacher-coordinator in establishing a cooperative program will find that the time element involved for such a program is much greater than for a classroom situation without the cooperative program. The National Guideline states, "The responsibility of the distributive education teacher-coordinator cannot be equated with those of regular classroom teachers." 

The National Guideline, and the Utah Handbook recommend that compensation of an extended contract time should be given to distributive education teacher-coordinators establishing a cooperative program. This contract should be a ten, or eleven-month contract for those distributive education teacher-coordinators who have established a cooperative program.

49Harris, Requirements For Teacher-Coordinators, p. 73.
50Guide, p. 86.
51Ibid.
Coordinating Other Vocational Cooperative Programs

The responsibilities of each distributive education teacher-coordinator of a distributive education cooperative program are the same, but the work load of each teacher-coordinator will vary with different schools. Because of the work load differences, the National Guideline suggests:

"...it may be possible for one teacher-coordinator to serve students in several occupational fields, however, the teacher-coordinator should then be qualified in these several occupational fields, and should not coordinate more than 30 students in his field." \(^{53}\)

The Utah Handbook also suggests the above.

\(^{53}\) Guide, p. 89.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

The following procedures were used to identify the practices of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators in the selection and utilization of training stations and training sponsors for the distributive education cooperative program.

Literature Search

A literature search was conducted of the National Guideline, the Utah Handbook, and authorities to identify suggested criteria that distributive education teacher-coordinators should use in the selection of training stations and training sponsors. The purpose of the literature review was to:

1. Identify the nationally recognized procedures and practices related to the subject.

2. Extract those procedures and practices which were common to each guideline and in some cases, which authorities mentioned as essential.

3. Construct a questionnaire on the basis of the practices identified.

4. Use the constructed questionnaire to conduct a survey of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators.

Mailing List

A mailing list of the total population of Utah distributive educa-
tion teacher-coordinators, published by the State Department of Education, was obtained from the Department of Business Education at Utah State University.

**Pilot Study and Appendixes**

A pilot study of the original questionnaire was conducted at Sky View and Logan high schools. The questionnaire was personally administered to the two teacher-coordinators to enhance the relevance of the final questionnaire that was used in the survey of the 45 Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators operating cooperative programs. The researcher and teacher-coordinator at each high school orally discussed each question for relevance, content, and clarity.

The results of the pilot study are revealed in Appendix A. This appendix shows two questions that were of no value and eliminated from the final questionnaire. In addition, Appendix A includes two questions which were added to the final questionnaire. Appendix A also includes some questions and responses which were changed because of their awkwardness to the reader.

**Process For Obtaining Survey Questionnaire**

The questionnaire and cover letter, Appendix B, were mailed to the 45 distributive education teacher-coordinators in Utah. When responses were no longer received for a period of three weeks, a follow-up letter, Appendix C, was used to remind the distributive education teacher-coordinators that their completed questionnaire was needed for the completion of the study. When responses again failed to be received, the telephone was used to remind the teacher-coordinators of the importance of receiving their questionnaire.
Decision Criteria

A decision criteria had to be made in order to determine if Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators were following the recommended National Guideline and Utah Handbook. The decision criteria used in this study to determine if Utah teacher-coordinators were following the recommended guidelines for the development of training stations and training sponsors was based on at least 50 per cent of the Utah teacher-coordinators, responding to the alternatives that were recommended by the National and State Guidelines.
coordinator, he should rely on various outside resources for help.

Who Should Select The Training Station

The distributive education teacher-coordinators were asked who they believed should select the training station for the student-learner. As seen in Table 1, 36.3 per cent of the teacher-coordinators believed that the combined effort of the coordinator, student, and advisory committee should select the training station. The other response checked was the advisory committee by 30.3 per cent. No Utah teacher-coordinator selected the school administration (refer to Table 1).

Table 1. Distributive education teacher-coordinators' responses to who should be responsible for selecting training stations for the student-learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Coordinator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Advisory Committee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coordinator and the Advisory Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coordinator, Advisory Committee, and the Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coordinator, the Student and Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who Does Select The Training Station

In actual practice, 39.4 per cent of the Utah distributive education
teacher-coordinators selected the majority of their training stations. Thirty point three per cent indicated that the student selected the training station and 27.3 per cent responded that both the coordinator and student selected the majority of training stations. No Utah teacher-coordinator made use of the advisory committee or school administration (refer to Table 2).

Table 2. Teacher-coordinators' practices as to who selects the training station for the student-learner in his own position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Coordinator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Advisory Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coordinator and the Student</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coordinator and Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reputation and Competency of the Training Station and Training Sponsor

The Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators were asked if they considered the reputation of the training station and competency of the training sponsor. Reputation was defined as ethical business practices, while competency was defined as businessman skills and technical aspects of the occupation.
Reputation of the Training Station

A majority of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators, 66.6 per cent, believed the reputation of the training station should always be considered. Twenty-seven point three per cent of the Utah teacher-coordinators thought the issue as usually important (refer to Table 3).

Table 3. Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators responses to the importance of the reputation of the training station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competency of the Training Sponsor

A majority of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators, 60.6 per cent, believed the competency of the training sponsor is always of importance to the student. In addition, 39.4 per cent believed the competency of the training sponsor is usually of importance to the student (refer to Table 4, p. 25).

Placing The Student

In developing a distributive cooperative program, it is essential
that the teacher-coordinator meet the objectives of the students' career goals by providing on-the-job training experiences that are meaningful to the student. The selection of a specific training station for placing the student is the responsibility of the distributive education teacher-coordinator.

Per Cent Of Students Placed On Training Stations

On the question of how many students from the teacher-coordinator's total enrollment were placed on a training station for on-the-job training, the Utah teacher-coordinators' responses were divided equally between the suggested alternatives. Thirty per cent of the teacher-coordinators said 90-100 per cent of their total class enrollment was placed on a training station. The remaining alternatives were equally divided, with 23.3 per cent going to each alternative response (refer to Table 5, p. 26).
Table 5. Number of students placed and not placed on a training station in this current school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100 Per Cent are Placed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-90 Per Cent are Placed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-75 Per Cent are Placed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 60 Per Cent are Placed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Three Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Per Cent Of Students Having Jobs When They Enter Cooperative Programs

Table 6 shows 37.5 per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated that more than 20 per cent of their students have jobs when they enter the cooperative program. Twenty-five per cent of the teacher-coordinators responded that 15-20 per cent of their students have jobs before entering the cooperative program (refer to Table 6, p. 27).

Best Method Of Placement

On the issue of what the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed was the best method of placing cooperative part-time students on training stations, a majority, 72.7 per cent, responded that several qualified students apply for an interview and the employer has final selection (refer to Table 7, p. 27).
Table 6. Per cent of students having jobs when they enter the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Per Cent Have Jobs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Per Cent Have Jobs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 Per Cent Have Jobs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 Per Cent Have Jobs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 Per Cent Have Jobs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50 Per Cent Have Jobs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100 Per Cent Have Jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32(^a)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)One Utah distributive education teacher-coordinator did not answer this question.

Table 7. Method that Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed best accomplished the placement of cooperative part-time students on training stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Nominates A Student For The Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Finds His Own Position With Little Help From Anyone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Qualified Students Apply For An Interview And The Employer Has Final Selection</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Nominates A Student For The Position And Student Finds His Own Position With Little Help From Anyone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher-Coordinators Most Prevalent Method Of Placement

On the question of what method the teacher-coordinator believed was the most prevalent in the placement of the majority of his students on a training station, 50 per cent Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed several qualified students apply for an interview with the employer having final selection. The only other response checked with any frequency was the student finding his own position with little help from anyone, 34.4 per cent (refer to Table 8).

Table 8. Method most prevalent in placing the distributive education teacher-coordinators' own students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Nominates A Student For The Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Finds His Own Position With Little Help From Anyone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Qualified Students Apply For An Interview And The Employer Has Final Selection</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify) Coordinator Nominates A Student For The Position And Student Finds His Own Position With Little Help From Anyone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Finds His Own Position With Little Help From Anyone And Several Qualified Students Apply For An Interview And The Employer Has Final Selection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aOne Utah distributive education teacher-coordinator did not answer this question.
Obstacle Encountered in Preventing Best Believed Method of Placement

Forty-five point five percent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated that the obstacle preventing them from using the best method of placing cooperative part-time students on training stations was the number of training stations available. The only other response checked with any frequency, 27.3 percent, was the combination of coordination time and the number of training stations available (refer to Table 9).

Table 9. Obstacle encountered in preventing the best method of placing cooperative part-time students on training stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Work Stations Available In Students' Career Goals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Time And Number Of Work Stations Available In Students' Career Goals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Work Stations Available In Students' Career Goals And Financial Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students Placed

Table 10 indicates that Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed the majority of students, 43.3 percent, are placed on
training stations to make money. Thirty-three point three believed they were placed to meet students' career interests (refer to Table 10).

Table 10. Reason students select cooperative programs and are placed on training stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Job To Make Money</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Students' Career Interests</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Counselors Assign The Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Job To Make Money And Meet Students' Career Interests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Students' Career Interests And Some Counselors Assign The Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30a</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Three Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Reason Students Were Not Placed

Table 11 indicates 41.4 per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed the lack of training stations was the reason students were not placed on training stations. The other response checked with any frequency was attitudes and personalities, 31.0 per cent (refer to Table 11, p. 31.).

Students Acquiring A Learning Experience

To help the student acquire a learning experience from the cooperative program, both the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor should
Table 11. Summary of reasons students were not placed on training stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Academic Grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Training Stations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Attitudes and Personalities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Academic Grades And Poor Attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Training Stations And Poor Attitudes and Personalities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29a</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"a"Four Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Implementing An On-The-Job Training Program

A majority of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators, 60.6 per cent, thought it usually important that the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor jointly plan, organize, and regulate an on-the-job training program for the student. Twenty-seven point three per cent of the teacher-coordinators thought the issue as always important (refer to Table 12, p. 32).

Working With The Training Sponsor

Of the respondents, 75.8 per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated they usually or always work with the training sponsor in implementing an on-the-job training program (refer to Table 13, p. 32).
Table 12. Importance of the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor to jointly plan, organize, and regulate the implementing of an on-the-job training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Distributive education teacher-coordinator and training sponsor working together in implementing an on-the-job training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obstacle Encountered in Working With Training Sponsor

Thirty-two point two per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated that the major obstacle of working with the training sponsor in implementing an on-the-job training program, was the employer did not want to take the time. Another close response to
the previous issue, was the student having the job before entering the
distributive education cooperative program, 25.8 per cent (refer to
Table 14).

Table 14. Major obstacle of working with a training sponsor in imple­
menting an on-the-job training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Had The Job Before Entering The Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Coordination Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Does Not Want To Take The Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Had The Job Before Entering The Program, Lack Of Coordination Time, And Employer Does Not Want To Take The Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Had The Job Before Entering The Program And Employer Does Not Want To Take The Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Coordination Time And Employer Does Not Want To Take The Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31a</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

**Hours A Student Works Per Week**

The hours of work a student works per week should provide that stu­
dent with a learning experience which will make him employable toward his career goal. The hours of work per week should also conform to the state
child labor laws which apply to students in cooperative distributive education programs.

Minimum Number Of Hours Per Week

The Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated, 45.5 per cent, the minimum number of hours a student should work per week be 10-15 hours. Twenty-seven point three per cent teacher-coordinators indicated that 15-20 hours per week be the minimum hours a student should work. Another response, 21.2 per cent, indicated under 10 hours per week was sufficient to the issue (refer to Table 15).

Table 15. Minimum number of hours that a student should work per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10 Hours Per Week</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 Hours Per Week</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 Hours Per Week</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 Hours Per Week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students Working Less Than The Minimum Number Of Hours

A majority, 94.0 per cent, of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated that under 10 per cent of their students worked less than the minimum number of hours they had recommended (refer to Table 16, p. 35).
Table 16. Number of students working less than the minimum number of hours that the teacher-coordinator recommended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10 Per Cent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 Per Cent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30 Per Cent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Number Of Hours Per Week

Fifty-one point five per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated that the maximum number of hours a student should work per week be 25-30 hours. The other response with any frequency was 20-25 hours per week indicated by 33.3 per cent (refer to Table 17).

Table 17. Maximum number of hours that a student should work per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25 Hours Per Week</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Hours Per Week</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35 Hours Per Week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40 Hours Per Week</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students Working More Than The Maximum Number Of Hours

A majority, 61.3 per cent of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators responded that under 10 per cent of their students work more than the maximum number of hours they had recommended (refer to Table 18).

Table 18. Number of students working more than the maximum number of hours that the distributive education teacher-coordinator recommended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10 Per Cent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 Per Cent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30 Per Cent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31a</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Two Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Student Rotation On-The-Job

The training station should allow the student to experience many functions that are necessary in the operation of a particular business during the fifteen-hours per week that a student works throughout the year.

Necessity Of Job Rotation

A majority, 60.6 per cent, of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed a job rotation schedule was usually necessary to provide increased responsibility in the duties of the student as the school
year progressed (refer to Table 19).

Table 19. Necessity of a designated job rotation schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are Students Rotated

The Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated, 48.5 per cent, that the students are seldom rotated in their programs. Another response, 30.3 per cent of the teacher-coordinators said their students were usually rotated (refer to Table 20, p. 38).

Feasible Or Realistic

On the question of whether or not job rotation is feasible or realistic, the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators responded to a variety of answer alternatives. The highest response to the question was 30.3 per cent of the teacher-coordinators indicating job rotation is seldom feasible or realistic. This was followed by usually feasible or realistic, 27.3 per cent; 15.1 per cent indicating always or no opinion, and 9.1 per cent indicating other (refer to Table 21, p. 38).
Table 20. Extent that students are rotated on-the-job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Question of feasibility or realistic job rotation for the student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obstacles Preventing Job Rotation

A majority, 50 per cent, of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated that the major obstacle preventing job rotation was the training sponsor not being willing to rotate (refer to Table 22, p. 39).
Table 22. Summary of reasons why students work throughout the year on a job that requires a short learning period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Required To Learn Job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Business Community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Sponsor Is Not Willing To Rotate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Business Community And Training Sponsor Is Not</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing To Rotate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30a</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThree Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Working Throughout The Year On A Job That Requires A Short Learning Period

As seen in Table 23, the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated by 38.7 per cent, a student should seldom remain on a job throughout the year which required a short learning period. Other high responses to the issue were usually, 25.8 per cent, and always, 22.6 per cent (refer to Table 23, p. 40).

Students Working Throughout The Year

Thirty-eight point seven per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated that seldom do their students remain on a job which required a short learning period, while 41.9 per cent of the teacher-coordinators indicated that their students usually remain on a job which requires a short learning period (refer to Table 24, p. 40).
Table 23. Remaining on a job that requires a short learning period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31a</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Two Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Table 24. Teacher-coordinators' students working throughout the year on a job which requires a short learning period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31a</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Two Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Obstacle Preventing Job Rotation Of Job Requiring Short Learning Period

A large number, 46.4 per cent, of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated that the number of jobs in the community
prevented the student from being removed from a job which required a short learning period (refer to Table 25).

Table 25. Summary of reasons preventing the student from being removed from a job which requires a short learning period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Needs Of The Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Jobs In The Community</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Had Job Before Entering The Cooperative Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Needs Of The Student And Student Had Job Before Entering Cooperative Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Needs Of The Student, Number Of Jobs In The Community, And Student Had Job Before Entering Cooperative Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Jobs In The Community And Student Had Job Before Entering Cooperative Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28a</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aFive Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Determining The Progress Of The Student

To insure a purposeful learning experience, so that the student may secure worthwhile employment when he completes high school, the distributive education teacher-coordinator and the training sponsor should develop means of evaluating the progress of the student.
Progress Determined

Thirty-nine point four per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed progress of the student should be determined with a standardized form that the training sponsor completes regularly and verbal conversation carried out between the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor. The verbal conversation between the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor was also checked by 36.4 per cent (refer to Table 26, p. 43).

Procedure Used By Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators

Thirty-nine point four per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated verbal conversation between the training sponsor and the coordinators was their main procedure to determine the progress of the students. The other response checked was the combination of observation only, a standard form which the training sponsor completes regularly, and verbal conversation between the teacher-trainer and the training sponsor, 30.3 per cent (refer to Table 27, p. 44).

Manner Determining Students' Progress

A majority, 69.7 per cent, of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators indicated it was most efficient to determine the students' progress in the manner that they practiced (refer to Table 28, p. 45).

Adjusting Student Problems

The distributive education teacher-coordinator and training sponsor should work together in helping the student adjust from the academic world to the world of work. The student will encounter various problems at his training station and with the help of the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor these various problems encountered by the student can be adjusted.
Table 26. Determining the progress of the student who is working in a training station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Standard Form Which The Training Sponsor Completes Regularly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Conversation Between You And The Training Sponsor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper-Pencil Test</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Only And Verbal Conversation Between You And The Training Sponsor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation, A Standard Form Which The Training Sponsor Completes Regularly, Verbal Conversation Between You And The Training Sponsor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation, A Standard Form Which The Training Sponsor Completes Regularly, Verbal Conversation Between You And The Training Sponsor, Paper-Pencil Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Standard Form Which The Training Sponsor Completes Regularly, Verbal Conversation Between You And The Training Sponsor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Standard Form Which The Training Sponsor Completes Regularly, Verbal Conversation Between You And The Training Sponsor, Paper-Pencil Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who Should Solve On-The-Job Problems

A majority, 73.3 per cent, of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed that the coordinator and businessman should help the student solve on-the-job problems that may arise during his period of
Table 27. Main procedure used by Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators to determine the progress of their students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Standard Form Which The Training Sponsor Completes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Conversation Between You And The Training Sponsor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper-Pencil Test</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation, A Standard Form Which The Training Sponsor Completes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation, A Standard Form Which The Training Sponsor Completes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly, Verbal Conversation Between You And The Training Sponsor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Standard Form Which The Training Sponsor Completes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly, Verbal Conversation Between You And The Training Sponsor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

enrollment in the distributive education teacher-cooperative program (refer to Table 29, p. 45).

Who Does Solve On-The-Job Problems

Table 30 indicates 66.6 per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators and businessmen solve the students' on-the-job problems with the student in their respective cooperative programs. No Utah distributive education teacher-coordinator involved the administrative personnel (refer to Table 30, p. 46).
Table 28. Main reasons determining the students' progress in the manner of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It Is Most Efficient</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Training Sponsor Prefers This Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Does Not Allow For Any Other Way</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It Is Most Efficient And The Training Sponsor Prefers This Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Training Sponsor Prefers This Way And Time Does Not Allow For Any Other Way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29. Persons involved in solving the students' on-the-job problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Businessman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, And The Businessman</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, Administrative Personnel, And The Businessman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, The Businessman, And Parent Of The Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30(^a)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Three Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.
Table 30. Solving students' on-the-job problems in the distributive education teacher-coordinators own cooperative program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Businessman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator And The Businessman</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30(^a)</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Three Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Major Problem Encountered in Solving Students' On-The-Job Problems

Table 31 shows 51.6 per cent, of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators giving no opinion to the major problem which confronts them in solving a student's on-the-job problems (refer to Table 31).

Table 31. Major problem that confronts the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators in solving students' on-the-job problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Sponsor Not Willing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Spend The Time With You</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Allowed For Coordination Visits</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visiting On-The-Job Training Stations

It is important that the distributive education teacher-coordinator visit on-the-job training stations to assure that it is contributing to the development of occupational competence of the student. The teacher-coordinator should be given one-half hour per week, per student, of coordination time.

Coordination Hours Per Week Per Student

Fifty-one point eight per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed they should spend one-half hour per week, per student, coordinating. Forty-one point three per cent believed a quarter-hour per week, per student, should be spent coordinating (refer to Table 32).

Table 32. Hours per week per student spent coordinating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Hour Per Week</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Hour Per Week</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Quarters Of An Hour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Hour Per Week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Four Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Minimum Visits To The Student

A majority, 53.1 per cent, of Utah distributive education teacher-
coordinators believed the minimum number of times a coordinator should
visit the student on-the-job be once a month (refer to Table 33).

Table 33. Minimum number of times a coordinator should visit the student
on-the-job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once A Week</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice A Week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Every Two Weeks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once A Month</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32(^a)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)One Utah distributive education teacher-coordinator did not answer this question.

**Frequency Of Visiting Time**

Forty-five point one per cent of the Utah distributive education
teacher-coordinators indicated they get a chance to visit the student
on-the-job once a month. The only other response checked with any
frequency was once every two weeks (refer to Table 34, p. 49).

**Obstacle Preventing Coordinator From Visiting Student**

A majority, 70.0 per cent, of Utah distributive education teacher-
coordinators indicated in Table 35, lack of coordination time was the
chief obstacle that prevented them from visiting the student on-the-job
(refer to Table 35, p. 49).
Table 34. Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators visiting the student on-the-job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once A Week</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice A Week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Every Two Weeks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once A Month</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Every Six Months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31^a</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aTwo Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Table 35. Chief obstacle that prevents Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators from visiting the student on-the-job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Coordination Time</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Financial Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Of Interest From Businessman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30^a</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aThree Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.

Additional Coordination Time

A majority, 90.9 per cent, of Utah distributive education teacher-
coordinators indicated their coordination time remained the same even though the number of students in the cooperative program increased (refer to Table 36).

Table 36. Coordination time in proportion to the number of students enrolled in distributive education cooperative programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Remains The Same</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Get More Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obstacle Preventing Additional Coordination Time

On the question of what was the chief obstacle in preventing an increase in coordination time, 36.4 per cent of the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators responded to the alternative of other, stating that there was no problem preventing an increase in coordination time. Thirty point three did indicate financial support as an alternative to the issue, while 24.2 per cent selected school administrator indifference (refer to Table 37, p. 51).

Contract Time For Utah Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators

The time element for establishing a distributive education cooperative program is much greater than for a classroom situation without the cooperative program.
Table 37. Chief obstacle which would prevent an increase in coordination time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator Indifference</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support And School Administrator Indifference</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length Of Contract

A majority, 63.6 per cent of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators believed a ten or eleven-month contract is always necessary in running a distributive education cooperative program (refer to Table 38).

Table 38. Necessity of a ten or eleven-month contract in running a distributive education cooperative program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utah Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators Contract Length

Table 39, indicates that 60.6 per cent of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators have a ten-month contract for conducting a distributive education cooperative program during the school year (refer to Table 39).

Table 39. Length of Utah distributive education teacher coordinators' contracts for the school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine-month Contract</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten-month Contract</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven-month Contract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve-month Contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordinating Other Vocational Programs

The objectives of developing a vocational program are the same, but the work load for each program will vary with different schools and the teacher-coordinator may serve students in several occupational fields.

Other Vocational Programs

When the Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators were asked if they coordinated students from other vocational programs, 51.8 per cent indicated they did not (refer to Table 40, p.53).
Table 40. Coordinating students from other vocational programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate Responses</th>
<th>Number Of Teachers Responding</th>
<th>Percentage Of Teachers Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industrial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Of Any: (Please Specify)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29a</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aFour Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators did not answer this question.*
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

A curriculum should fulfill the goals of the student in order to provide those students with the best opportunities to gain entrance into and succeed in the business world. A program in the broad field of vocational education which is trying to meet the needs of the student is distributive education with the use of the cooperative method. The cooperative method not only provides classroom learning experience, but on-the-job training as well for the student. The success of the cooperative distributive education program, however, can be directly attributed to the ability of the teacher-coordinator.

The following procedures were used to identify the practices of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators in the selection of training stations and training sponsors for their distributive education cooperative programs. A literature search was conducted of the National Guideline, the Utah Handbook, and selected authorities; a mailing list published by the State Department of Education of Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators was obtained and a pilot study of the original questionnaire was conducted to enhance the relevance of the final questionnaire that was used in the survey of 45 Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators.

The purpose of this paper was to determine the degree to which the distributive education teacher-coordinators, in the secondary schools of Utah, followed the accepted guidelines in the development of training
stations and training sponsors. More specifically, this study determined the degree that Utah distributive education teacher-coordinators followed the accepted guidelines, or met the recommended outline in the development of training stations.

The criteria used are:

1. Training station must be carefully selected.
2. The competencies and reputation of the training station and training sponsor must be considered when placing the student in his prospective training station.
3. The student must be placed in a training station that provides a learning experience in his career interest area.
4. The student must work a minimum number of hours per week, and have a job rotation schedule on-the-job if he is to obtain competence in his career goal.
5. The teacher-coordinator and training sponsor must use various methods to determine the progress of the student.
6. The teacher-coordinator, training sponsor, and student must work together in solving problems that a student may acquire on-the-job.
7. The teacher-coordinator must be given coordination time to meet all the responsibilities of a distributive education cooperative program.
8. The teacher-coordinator must be qualified to meet the students' needs in each vocational area that he is serving.

Findings

The findings of the study include, (1) what Utah teacher-coordinators believed were the criteria for developing training stations and training sponsors, and (2) what Utah teacher-coordinators are doing in actual prac-
tice for the development of training stations and training sponsors.

1. The Utah teacher-coordinators believed the selection of the training station should be a combined effort of the coordinator, the student and advisory committee. More than 75 per cent of the teacher-coordinators and students selected the training station with little help from the other resources available. No Utah teacher-coordinator made use of the school administration in the selection process.

2. More than 80 per cent of Utah teacher-coordinators believed the reputation of the training sponsor and competency of the training station should be considered before placing students on-the-job in their career interest area, and in actual practice, did consider the reputation and competency of the training station and training sponsor before placing a large percentage of their students on training stations.

3. The Utah teacher-coordinators believed that the best method of placing a student is to have several qualified students apply for an interview with the employer having final selection. In actual practice, 50 per cent of the teacher-coordinators followed this method of placing the student on-the-job. The lack of training stations was attributed as the main obstacle in preventing the best method of placing a student on-the-job in his career goal area.

4. In actual practice, more than 50 per cent of the Utah teacher-coordinators placed students on-the-job to make money than to meet the students' career goal areas. The attributing factors were the lack of training stations and poor attitudes and personalities of the student.

5. The Utah teacher-coordinators believed it should be the responsibility of the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor to plan, organize, and regulate an on-the-job program. In actual practice, more than 75 per
cent of the Utah teacher-coordinators worked jointly with the training sponsor in implementing an on-the-job training program. The major obstacle encountered in working with the training sponsor to implement an on-the-job program was the training sponsor not wanting to take the time.

6. The Utah teacher-coordinators indicated a student should work a minimum of 10-15 hours per week, and a maximum of 25-30 hours per week on a training station in the students' career goal areas. In actual practice, more than 90 per cent of the teacher-coordinators had their students work less than the minimum preferred hours per week. Over 60 per cent of the teacher-coordinators had students work more than the maximum preferred hours per week on a training station.

7. The Utah teacher-coordinators believed there should be a job training program to insure that a student is gaining a learning experience in his career goal area. In actual practice, a job training plan was seldom used in more than 50 per cent of the cases, for it was deemed seldom feasible or realistic and the training sponsor would not want to rotate the student.

8. More than 50 per cent Utah teacher-coordinators believed a student should seldom remain on-the-job requiring a short learning period while in actual practice, more than 50 per cent of the Utah teacher-coordinators indicated that a student usually remains on-the-job requiring a short learning period. The teacher-coordinators attributed the lack of training stations as the main reason why students remain on-the-job requiring a short learning period.

9. The Utah teacher-coordinators, more than 75 per cent, indicated that a combination of observation, a standard form that the training sponsor completes regularly, and verbal conversation between the teacher-
coordinator and training sponsor should be the method of determining the progress of the student. In actual practice, the Utah teacher-coordinators used observation, a standard form that the training sponsor completed regularly, and verbal conversation between the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor as a method of determining the progress of the student.

10. The majority of Utah teacher-coordinators, more than 70 per cent, believed that the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor should work with the student in solving students' on-the-job problems. In actual practice, the Utah teacher-coordinators and training sponsor worked with the student to solve the students' on-the-job problems.

11. The Utah teacher-coordinators, more than 50 per cent, believed that the coordinator should be given one-half hour per week, per student, and the minimum number of visits to a training station should be once a month. In actual practice, more than 90 per cent of the Utah teacher-coordinators visit the training station for coordination activities at least once a month.

12. In actual practice, 90 per cent of the Utah teacher-coordinators do not receive additional coordination time for conducting the coordination activities that are needed to meet the objectives of the cooperative program when student enrollment increases. The obstacle that prevented additional coordination time to meet the objectives of the cooperative program were financial support and school administrator indifference.

13. In actual practice, more than 60 per cent of the Utah teacher-coordinators do not coordinate students from other occupational fields during the school year.

Conclusions

The findings suggest that Utah teacher-coordinators do support or do
not support the National Guideline and Utah Handbook in the development of training stations and training sponsors and suggest the following conclusions:

1. Based on the guideline criteria that the teacher-coordinator use available resources in the selection of training stations, and the finding that Utah teacher-coordinators depart from using the school administration and advisory committee in selection process, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are not following the National Guideline and Utah Handbook in using all available resources in the selection of training stations.

2. Based on the guideline criteria, that the reputation of the training station and competency of the training sponsor be considered before placing students on-the-job, and the finding that Utah teacher-coordinators recognize the importance of considering the competency of the training sponsor and reputation of the training station, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are supporting the National Guideline and Utah Handbook on the importance of the reputation and competency of the training station and training sponsor.

3. Based on the guideline criteria that the teacher-coordinator has the responsibility to place all students on-the-job in their career goal areas, and the finding that a majority of Utah teacher-coordinators place a large percentage of students on-the-job to make money, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators do not support the National Guideline and Utah Handbook in placing students on-the-job in their career goal areas.

4. Based on the guideline criteria that the student should be placed on-the-job by having several qualified students apply for an interview, with the employer having final selection, and the three findings that
(1) only one-half of the Utah teacher-coordinators are following this procedure, (2) the lack of training stations prevents the placing of students on-the-job, and (3) student finds his own position with little help from anyone, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are not supporting the National Guideline and Utah Handbook on the procedure of placing a student on-the-job in his career goal area.

5. Based on the guideline criteria that it is the responsibility of the teacher-coordinator to place a student on a job that is in his career goal area, and the finding that the lack of training stations and poor attitudes and personalities of the students, prevent many Utah teacher-coordinators from placing the students on-the-job to meet their career goal areas, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are not following the National Guideline and Utah Handbook on the responsibilities of placing a student on-the-job in his career interest area.

6. Based on the guideline criteria that the teacher-coordinator and training sponsor jointly work together in implementing an on-the-job program, and the finding that Utah teacher-coordinators do work jointly with the training sponsor, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are following the National Guideline and Utah Handbook in implementing an on-the-job program.

7. Based on the guideline criteria that a student work an average of 15 hours per week, throughout the school year to gain competency in his career goal area; and not to exceed the child labor law of 40 hours per week, and the finding that Utah teacher-coordinators have their students work the preferred number of hours per week, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are following the National Guideline and Utah Handbook
on the preferred number of hours a student should work in his career goal area.

8. Based on the guideline criteria that a job training plan be used to insure a student of gaining a competent learning experience in his career goal area, and the finding that Utah teacher-coordinators seldom use a training plan, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are not following the National Guideline and Utah Handbook in using a job training plan to insure a student of gaining a competent learning experience in his career goal area.

9. Based on the guideline criteria that a student not remain on a job requiring a short learning period, so that he may gain competency in his career goal area, and the finding that the student usually remains on a job requiring a short learning period, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are not following the National Guideline and Utah Handbook in finding a suitable training station that meets the students' career goal areas.

10. Based on the guideline criteria that the teacher-coordinator use various methods in determining the progress of the student, and the finding that Utah teacher-coordinators use some of the various methods available to determine the progress of the student, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are not following the National Guideline and Utah Handbook in using various methods in determining the progress of the student.

11. Based on the guideline criteria that the teacher-coordinator, training sponsor, and student work together in solving students' on-the-job problems, and the finding that Utah teacher-coordinators work with the training sponsor and student to solve students' on-the-job problems, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are following the National Guide-
line and Utah Handbook in solving students' on-the-job problems.

12. Based on the guideline criteria that the teacher-coordinator be given one-half hour per week, per student, for coordination time, and the finding that many Utah teacher-coordinators visit the training station once a month, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are following the recommended National Guideline and Utah Handbook on the number of times a teacher-coordinator should visit a training station.

13. Based on the guideline criteria that the teacher-coordinator be given additional coordination time when student enrollment increases above 30 students in the cooperative program, and the finding that Utah teacher-coordinators do not receive additional coordination time to meet the objectives of the cooperative program, it is concluded that the Utah teacher-coordinators are not meeting criteria established by the National Guideline and Utah Handbook to operate an effective cooperative program.

14. Based on the guideline criteria that the teacher-coordinator operating a cooperative program will have a greater work load than a teacher in a classroom situation, the allowances for compensating the teacher-coordinator should be in terms of an extended contract time, and the finding that Utah teacher-coordinators in most cases, receive an extended contract, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are following the National Guideline and Utah Handbook in receiving extended contract time to operate a cooperative program.

15. Based on the guideline criteria that the teacher-coordinator teach those vocational occupations that he is qualified to teach, and each teacher-coordinator be responsible for not more than 30 students, and the finding that most Utah teacher-coordinators do not teach in other occupational areas, it is concluded that Utah teacher-coordinators are follow-
ing the National Guideline and Utah Handbook in teaching those vocational occupations that he is qualified to teach.

Recommendations

The Utah teacher-coordinators should continue to follow the National Guideline and Utah Handbook on their recommended procedures in the following areas:

1. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators considering the importance of the reputation of the training station and competency of the training sponsor.

2. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators placing students on-the-job in their career goal areas.

3. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators and training sponsors working jointly in implementing an on-the-job training program.

4. The issue of the preferred number of hours a student should work in his career goal area throughout the school year.

5. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators and training sponsors working with the students to solve student on-the-job problems.

6. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators receiving an extended contract for operating a cooperative program.

7. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators serving those vocational occupations that he is qualified to serve, and to be responsible for not more than 30 students throughout the school year.

The Utah teacher-coordinators should follow the National Guideline and Utah Handbook on their recommended procedures in the following areas:

1. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators making use of all available resources in selecting available training stations in the students' career
goal areas.

2. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators having several qualified students apply for a job in their career goal areas and the employer having final selection.

3. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators incorporating a job training program to insure that a student is gaining a competent learning experience in his career goal area.

4. The issue of Utah teacher-coordinators using a number of evaluation techniques to determine the progress of the student.

The survey suggests further study is needed in the following areas:

1. To determine the possibility of developing training stations in students' career goal areas where those training stations are not available.

2. To determine the nature and scope of students' poor attitudes and personalities toward the distributive education cooperative program as compared to those students in other occupational programs.

3. To determine the awareness of school administrators of the activities of Utah teacher-coordinators as compared to those teachers not operating a cooperative program.

4. To determine the awareness of businessmen of the responsibility they have of meeting the career goals of the student.

5. To determine why Utah teacher-coordinators permit students in some cooperative programs to find their own training station with little help from anyone.

6. To determine why Utah teacher-coordinators allow students to enter a cooperative program when his main interest of selecting a cooperative program is to make money.
7. To determine the awareness of Utah teacher-coordinators of the various methods available to determine the progress of the student.

8. To determine the nature and scope of problems that confront Utah teacher-coordinators in solving students' on-the-job problems.

9. To determine why Utah teacher-coordinators do not place all their students on training stations in their career goal areas.
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APPENDIX I
Questionnaire Alterations Designed To Facilitate Analysis Of Data

Questions Omitted From Final Questionnaire

1. What is the minimum number of hours that a student works per week in your program?

2. What is the maximum number of hours that a student works per week in your program?

Questions Added To Final Questionnaire

3. What proportion of students have jobs when they enter your program?

27. What is the length of your contract for the school year?

Questions Reworded To Final Questionnaire

3. Do you feel the reputation (ethical business practices) of the training station within the community is of significant value to the success of your program?

5. What per cent of your students are placed on a training station for on-the-job training?

27. How do you determine the progress of your students?

30. Who solves students' on-the-job problems?

Responses Changed On Final Questionnaire

9b. Changed from number of work stations available to number of work stations available in students' career goals.

10c. Changed from provide a means of having a cooperative program to some counselors assign the program.

28. The only change was the addition of the letter e.

40. The only change was the addition of the letter e.
January 24, 1972

Dear D. E. Coordinator:

This is a survey to determine teacher-coordinator training station procedures in cooperative education. You are currently operating a D. E. cooperative program and can make a vital contribution toward the improvement of practices in working with training stations and business sponsors. This phase of the program is critical to meeting the occupational needs of all student-learners of distribution.

The information you provide will lead to better informed school administrators and business sponsors. Hopefully, better informed administrators will offer more services to the development of D. E. cooperative programs.

To be useful your answers must be personal and honest. You and your school name will not appear in any manner. All information received will be treated in strict confidence.

Please mail the completed questionnaire at your earliest possible convenience. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed to facilitate the return of the questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joseph D. Stephens

JdS: bh
Questionnaire

Background Information

A. Do you have a cooperative program in D. E.? __________________________

B. How many years have you been a D. E. coordinator at your present position? ________ years.

C. What is the total enrollment of students in the school that you are presently teaching in? _________ students.

D. How many students do you have enrolled in your cooperative program? _________ students.

E. What was your college major? __________________________

1. Who should select the training stations for the student learner?
   a. The coordinator 
   b. The advisory committee 
   c. The school administrator 
   d. The student 
   e. Other: (Please Specify)

2. In your own position as teacher-coordinator, who selects the majority of training stations?
   a. The coordinator 
   b. The advisory committee 
   c. The school administrator 
   d. The student 
   e. Other: (Please Specify)

3. Is the reputation (ethical business practices) of the training station considered when you are selecting training stations for your student?
   a. Never 
   b. Seldom 
   c. Usually 
   d. Always 
   e. No opinion 
   f. Other: (Please Specify)

4. Do you feel the competency (businessman skills and technical aspects of the occupation) of the training sponsor is of importance to the student?
   a. Never 
   b. Seldom 
   c. Usually 
   d. Always 
   e. No opinion 
   f. Other: (Please Specify)

5. In this current school year what per cent of your students are placed on a training station for on-the-job training?
   a. 90-100 per cent are placed 
   b. 75-90 per cent are placed 
   c. 60-75 per cent are placed 
   d. Under 60 per cent are placed 

6. What proportion of students have jobs when they enter your program?
   a. 0-5 per cent have jobs 
   b. 5-10 per cent have jobs 
   c. 10-15 per cent have jobs 
   d. 15-20 per cent have jobs 
   e. More: (Please Specify)
7. What method do you feel best accomplishes the placement of cooperative part-time students on training stations?
   a. Coordinator nominates a student for the position
   b. Student finds his own position with little help from anyone
   c. Several qualified students apply for an interview and the employer has final selection
   d. Other: (Please Specify)

8. What method is most prevalent in placing the majority of your students on a training station?
   a. Coordinator nominates a student for the position
   b. Student finds his own position with little help from anyone
   c. Several qualified students apply for an interview and the employer has final selection
   d. Other: (Please Specify)

9. What obstacles do you encounter preventing the best method of placing cooperative part-time students on training stations?
   a. Coordination time
   b. Number of work stations available in student career goal
   c. Financial Support
   d. Other: (Please Specify)

10. Why are the majority of your students placed on training stations?
    a. A job to make money
    b. Meet the student's career interests
    c. Some counselors assign the program
    d. Other: (Please Specify)

11. What would you consider the chief reason for those students who are not placed on training stations?
    a. Academic grades
    b. Lack of training stations
    c. Attitudes, personalities
    d. Other: (Please Specify)

12. Is it important that the teacher-coordinator plan, organize, and regulate with the training sponsor the implementing of an on-the-job training program?
    a. Never
    b. Seldom
    c. Usually
    d. Always
    e. Other: (Please Specify)

13. Do you work with the training sponsor in implementing an on-the-job training program?
    a. Never
    b. Seldom
    c. Usually
    d. Always
    e. Other: (Please Specify)

14. What is the major obstacle of working with a training sponsor in implementing an on-the-job training program?
    a. Student had the job before entering the program
    b. Lack of coordination time
    c. Employer does not want to take the time
    d. Other: (Please Specify)
15. What do you feel is the minimum number of hours that a student learner should work per week?
   a. Under ten hours per week
   b. 10-15 hours per week
   c. 15-20 hours per week
   d. Over 20 hours per week

16. How many of your students work less than the minimum number you recommend?
   a. Under 10 per cent
   b. 10-20 per cent
   c. 20-30 per cent
   d. More: (Please Specify)

17. What do you feel is the maximum number of hours that a student learner should work per week?
   a. 20-25 hours per week
   b. 25-30 hours per week
   c. 30-35 hours per week
   d. 35-40 hours per week

18. How many of your students work more than the maximum number you recommend?
   a. Under 10 per cent
   b. 10-20 per cent
   c. 20-30 per cent
   d. More: (Please Specify)

19. Do you feel a designated job rotation schedule (which provides for increased responsibility in the duties of the student learner as the school year progresses) is necessary?
   a. Never
   b. Seldom
   c. Usually
   d. Always
   e. No opinion
   f. Other: (Please Specify)

20. To what extent are your students rotated as to the above?
   a. Never
   b. Seldom
   c. Usually
   d. Always
   e. No opinion
   f. Other: (Please Specify)

21. Do you feel job rotation is feasible or realistic?
   a. Never
   b. Seldom
   c. Usually
   d. Always
   e. No opinion
   f. Other: (Please Specify)

22. What are the major obstacles which prevents job rotation for you?
   a. Time required to learn job
   b. Limited business community
   c. Training sponsor is not willing to rotate
   d. Other: (Please Specify)

23. Should a student be allowed to work throughout the year at a job which requires a short learning period (e.g., messenger, grocery, carry-out boy, cashier, checker, file clerk)?
   a. Never
   b. Seldom
   c. Usually
   d. Always
   e. Other: (Please Specify)
24. Do any of your students work throughout the year at a job which requires a short learning period?  
   a. Never  
   b. Seldom  
   c. Usually  
   d. Always  
   e. Other: (Please Specify)

25. What prevents the student from being removed from a job which requires a short learning period?  
   a. Income needs of the student  
   b. Number of jobs in the community  
   c. Student had job before entering cooperative program  
   d. Other: (Please Specify)

26. How do you feel the progress of the student should be determined?  
   a. Observation only  
   b. A standard form which the training sponsor completes regularly  
   c. Verbal conversation between you and the training sponsor  
   d. Paper-Pencil test  
   e. Other: (Please Specify)

27. What is the main procedure that you use to determine the progress of the students?  
   a. Observation only  
   b. A standard form which the training sponsor completes regularly  
   c. Verbal conversation between you and the training sponsor  
   d. Paper-Pencil test  
   e. Other: (Please Specify)

28. What is the chief reason for determining the student's progress in this manner?  
   a. It is most efficient  
   b. The training sponsor prefers this way  
   c. Time does not allow for any other way  
   d. Other: (Please Specify)

29. Who do you feel should solve the students' on-the-job problems?  
   a. Coordinator  
   b. Administrative personnel  
   c. The businessman  
   d. Other: (Please Specify)

30. In your program, who solves students' on-the-job problems?  
   a. Coordinator  
   b. Administrative personnel  
   c. The businessman  
   d. Other: (Please Specify)

31. What is the major problem that confronts you in solving a students' on-the-job problems?  
   a. Training sponsor not willing to spend the time with you  
   b. Time allowed for coordination visits  
   c. Other: (Please Specify)
32. How many hours per week per student do you feel should be spent coordinating?
   a. Quarter hour per week
   b. Half-hour per week
   c. Three quarters of an hour
   d. One hour per week

33. What do you feel is the minimum number of times a coordinator should visit the student on-the-job?
   a. Twice a week
   b. Once a week
   c. Once every two weeks
   d. Once a month
   e. Once every six months
   f. Other: (Please Specify)

34. On the average how often do you get a chance to visit the student on-the-job?
   a. Twice a week
   b. Once a week
   c. Once every two weeks
   d. Once a month
   e. Once every six months
   f. Other: (Please Specify)

35. What is the chief obstacle that prevents you from visiting the student on-the-job?
   a. Lack of coordination time
   b. Lack of financial support
   c. Lack of interest from businessman
   d. Other: (Please Specify)

36. Does your coordination time remain the same or do you gain more time as the number of students in your program increases?
   a. Time remains the same
   b. I get more time

37. What is the chief obstacle which would prevent an increase in coordination time?
   a. Financial support
   b. School administration indifference
   c. Other: (Please Specify)

38. Do you feel a ten or eleven-month contract is necessary in running a Distributive Education Cooperative Program?
   a. Never
   b. Seldom
   c. Usually
   d. Always
   e. Other: (Please Specify)

39. What is the length of your contract for the school year?
   a. Nine-month contract
   b. Ten-month contract
   c. Eleven-month contract
   d. Twelve-month contract

40. Do you coordinate students from other vocational programs?
   a. Agriculture
   b. Home Economics
   c. Business Education
   d. Trade and Industrial
   e. None
   f. Combination of any: (Please Specify)
February 18, 1972

Dear D. E. Coordinator:

Recently you received a survey, from Utah State University, to determine teacher-coordinator training station procedures in cooperative education.

To enhance the accuracy of this study, it is important to receive all completed questionnaires. If your completed questionnaire has not been mailed, please mail it at your earliest convenience.

If you have returned your questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joseph D. Stephens

JDS:bh
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