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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of management training programs* in two-year colleges is so recent and so dynamic that a problem of communication exists on a nationwide scope among people implementing these programs. Although the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the 1968 Amendments to this Act undertake to state objectives, there remain many diverse opinions concerning the nature of all vocational education, including these programs, and concerning current as well as appropriate directions.

The following three quotations by leaders in the field offer evidence of a basic difference of opinion about vocational education. Dr. Grant Venn of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare acknowledged the diversity and changing directions of vocational education:

*This study pertains to vocational or occupational management training programs such as post-secondary distributive education, marketing, retailing, management, and other similar programs in the two-year colleges. These programs operate under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the 1968 Amendments to this Act. These programs will hereinafter be referred to as "management training programs," or as "programs."
The time has come for vocational education to change both its functions and its aims. Vocational or occupational education must do more than provide a job skill as an immediate utility. It must provide a broad education and a marketable skill suitable to the times and the needs. Educators must reject the proposition that the proper role of vocational education is simply to be the caretaker of those who fail to make the grade in some more general system. Vocational education must be made a part of the mainstream of education.¹

Lowell Burkett, American Vocational Association Executive Director, took a more conservative view when he wrote of the implications of the 1963 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

The start seems promising, but the major challenges set forth in the Amendments still lie ahead. Although many who have little experience in vocational education herald the new act as a mandate to throw out everything from the past and start completely anew, the truth is that this legislation calls for nothing that couldn't or shouldn't have been done in implementing previous legislation. Since much was left undone, Congress saw fit to pass new legislation to force action. People must be served by vocational education programs that prepare them to enter and progress in their chosen occupations. Our performance will be evaluated on that basis. . . . Their (educators) performance will be tested in terms of their ability to deliver a program of vocational education that will prepare people for work.²

John Beaumont attempted to relate the Act to the social, economic and political confrontations of our times, as he

undertook a comprehensive view of the various tasks of voca-
tional education.

No one can state with certainty what new directions were intended nor predict what new directions will be taken. One can only attempt to relate the Act to the social, economic, and political confrontations of our times. As a vocational educator without portfolio, I will set forth what I see as the charge presented—not only to vocational education, but, in fact, to the educational institution in this nation.

A New Definition. Definitions are in a sense legalistic statements that limit and constrain. An understanding of the legal definition of vocational education is rendered more difficult when one attempts to get at the meaning of the words used in the section on "Definitions."

Some amplification of the definition in the Act may however be found in the following statements considered worthy of "serious consideration" by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

"Any dichotomy between academic and vocational education is outmoded."

"Developing attitudes, basic education skills and habits appropriate for the world of work is as important as skill training."

"Pre-vocational orientation is necessary to introduce pupils to the world of work and provide motivation."

"Meaningful career choices are a legitimate concern of vocational education."

"Vocational programs should be developmental, not terminal, providing maximum options for students to go to college, pursue post-secondary vocational and technical training, or find employment."

"Occupational education should be based on a spiral curriculum which treats concepts at higher and higher levels of complexity as the student moves through the program."

"Vocational preparation should be used to make academic education concrete and understandable, and academic education should point up the vocational implications of all education." (House Report No. 1647)

Within the context of these statements, it seems to me, vocational educators can serve the demands of a
technological society and the needs of man for a liberalizing experience in his educational development.\(^3\)

Management training programs within the two-year colleges can offer an opportunity to provide curricula appropriate to the different levels of student ability and sensitive to the differing needs of the business community, while recognizing the responsibility to maximize human resources.

As management training programs operate within the total objectives of the two-year institution and business program, curriculum builders must determine how management training can best serve in meeting these objectives by providing the curricula essential to the community manpower needs and the occupational and general educational needs of the individual.

Statement of the Problem

The general problem of this study involves a comparison of perceptions held by three significant groups concerning management training programs in two-year colleges in the United States. In response to questionnaires, representative

business leaders, instructors of management training programs, and state vocational directors evaluated the following five objectives:

**Semi-professional.**—To produce, with a two-year curriculum, managers who seek semi-professional positions at the supervisory or middle management levels upon completion of the program. The curriculum would consist of approximately equal amounts of general education and business courses.

**Technical.**—To produce, with a two-year curriculum, managers who seek positions which are best defined as technical. The curriculum would consist of one-fourth to one-third general education, remainder primarily concentrated in a technical area. (Technical—pertaining to technical performance of a job.)

**Supplemental training.**—To provide courses for persons who are presently employed but who need supplemental training for advancement in their present occupational field. The curriculum would consist of courses based on the needs of a specific occupational area or the needs of a specific industry.
Retraining.—To provide courses or curricula of varying lengths for persons who must have retraining in order to enter new occupational fields. The curriculum content would be based upon the ability level of the retrainee as well as the existing needs of the local or regional labor market.

Transfer.—To produce, with a two-year curriculum, managers who plan to transfer to senior colleges to complete the baccalaureate degree. The curriculum would consist of those courses, primarily general education, which normally constitute the first two years of the undergraduate degree. 4

Each of the three groups has a significant basis from which to view management training programs. Business leaders employ the graduates and utilize the abilities, skills, and competencies that the programs have helped produce. The program instructors have the opportunity for a close scrutiny of the local labor market and student needs and opportunities as they develop the local programs and work in daily contact with their students and the business community. Perceptions held by instructors affect what they do and the types of program they produce. State vocational directors

help write curricula, interpret the intentions of the law, and determine need for new programs.

The extent of any significant differences in perceptions of program purposes held by these three groups might be expected to reflect inefficiency, confusion, and dispersion of energy in the programs.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in the study:

1. There is a significant difference between the perceptions held by a national panel of business leaders and those perceptions held by state vocational directors on the present importance of each of several curriculum objectives.

2. There is a significant difference between the perceptions held by a national panel of business leaders and those perceptions held by state vocational directors on the desired future importance of each of several curriculum objectives.

3. There is a significant difference between perceptions held by a national panel of business leaders and those perceptions held by instructors on the present importance of each of several curriculum objectives.

4. There is a significant difference between perceptions held by a national panel of business leaders and those
perceptions held by instructors on the desired future importance of each of several curriculum objectives.

5. There is a significant difference in the perceptions held by state vocational directors and instructors on the present importance of each of the management training program curriculum objectives.

6. There is a significant difference in the perceptions held by state vocational directors and instructors on the desired future importance of each curriculum objective.

Significance of the Study

A national study of management training programs involving a comparison of perceptions of objectives could prove significant in identifying priority of objectives, present status, variety of concepts held, trends, and relationships between certain concepts and occupational roles. This study examines program objectives to determine if the two-year management training programs are directed toward meeting community needs. It attempts to ascertain if the objectives perceived by educators are the same ones that business leaders indicated as being important enough to challenge managers to return to school, and to encourage their employees toward more education to keep up to date.

It is hoped that sharing of the findings of this study with interested parties can provide a better understanding
of the flexibility for meeting community needs made possible by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. It is also hoped that the findings of this study would be of benefit to state vocational boards, curriculum designers, and educators working with management training programs.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study was concerned only with programs in publicly controlled two-year colleges.

2. This study was concerned only with vocational or occupational management training programs such as post-secondary distributive education, marketing, retailing, management, and other such programs in the two-year colleges operated under the 1963 Vocational Education Act and the 1968 Amendments to the Act.

3. This study was concerned only with the importance of five curriculum objectives to the management training programs in the two-year colleges.

Basic Assumptions

The assumptions upon which this study was based are:

1. That the five stated objectives which limit freedom of responses reflect commonly held objectives.
2. That the responses from the group of business leaders represent an adequate sample of the beliefs held by business leaders.
CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

American junior colleges spent a substantial part of the past four decades struggling with the admonition to adapt or perish. Recognition as institutions of higher education was a challenging force. Their goal was accreditation, the acceptance of transfer credit by universities. This search for identity, a place in the structure of higher education in America was the motivation of the community college through the 1950's. Recognition came as evidenced by numbers of students and institutions. Some foundations expressed interest. Federal legislation began to include more often the junior colleges in those eligible for higher education programs. By the sixties the junior college had found a respectable place in higher education which was seldom questioned.

Then education was the exciting thing during the sixties; it had the stage while war, poverty, and pollution waited in the wings. Federal funds were plunged into our colleges in an unprecedented way. Education held a top priority.
national policy, and the tremendous growth of the community college is a result. Educational voids were filled as demonstrated by the hundreds of thousands of students now attending these colleges. Around fifty new junior colleges were established each year during that decade. The number of students starting their college work there increased from one out of four to about one out of two. The sixties were the fabulous years for the junior colleges in America. 1

Vocational Education Legislation

The Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917 was enacted to meet the increasing demands of an industrial economy then reaching maturity. Large allotments went to vocational home economics and agriculture; lesser provisions were included for training in trades and industry.

The George-Barden Act of 1946 was introduced to meet changes in labor force demands over the nearly thirty-year period by expanding and promoting vocational education with increased federal expenditures and by encouraging vocational guidance.

During the next few years, the American economy continued to change, and manpower needs shifted considerably.

1Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Address to 50th Annual Convention, American Association of Junior Colleges. "The Juniors in Our System"
The changing industrial occupational mix, as well as a more sophisticated technology, caused a shift from a primarily agricultural and blue-collar labor force toward white-collar employment.

In response to this change in manpower needs, Congress reviewed the existing laws and enacted the Vocational Education Act of 1963. New funds for state and local vocational education programs were designed to prepare individuals for gainful employment, and included business and office occupations not covered by the previous laws.

During the next few years, employment opportunities increased in the professional, semi-professional, and technical fields. Demands in the public service field alone sometimes exceeded the available labor supply by five to one. Technological breakthroughs in the past five years have led to greater demands for trained personnel.

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 provided a way to bring about necessary changes to adapt vocational education to new manpower needs. These amendments placed resources and program flexibility at the discretion of state and local school agencies and thus were designed to focus on the major deficiencies of the past.
The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, affecting more than twenty-five million people a year, authorized programs to deal with the problems of increasing the availability of skilled manpower and the maximization of human resources facing the United States today and its changing world of work. Many old jobs have disappeared or have been altered with new ones always emerging. Relocations of industry as well as shifts in market demands have further complicated the labor market. Jobs for which untrained minds and physical strength have been sufficient have declined, while jobs requiring greater skills and advanced education have increased.

Review of Related Literature

A survey of early literature concerning the community college compared with the literature of today shows a dynamic progression from the policy statement of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1925:

The junior college is an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade. Its curriculum may include those courses usually offered in the first two years of the four-year college, in which case these courses must be identical, in scope and thoroughness, with corresponding courses of the standard four-year college. The junior college may, and is likely to, develop a different type of curriculum suited to the larger and ever-changing civic, social, religious, and vocational needs of the
entire community in which the college is located. It is understood that in this case also the work offered shall be on a level appropriate for high school graduates.2

Seashore said in 1949:

... we are now facing a new awakening to the effect that below the strictly professional, we have the semi-professional and skilled occupations which demand education adapted to that large mass of our American people who are not going to be the scholars but rather the workers in their respective fields in the countless avenues of industrial, governmental, social, artistic, and religious movements.3

In 1954, Starrak and Hughes wrote the following:

Changing conditions and technological advances in the fields of production and service have increased sharply the need for subprofessional and semitechnical workers. Between the learned professions at the top and the nontechnical trades and services at the bottom, there lies a large and rapidly increasing number of occupations which call for a high degree of intelligence, some scientific understanding and judgment and, in some cases, a considerable amount of manipulative skill.4

Starrak and Hughes suggested improved terminal education:

The failure of our higher educational institutions to serve the educational needs of all youth who knock at their doors should not be regarded as a wholesale indictment of them. The point we wish to make is . . .

---


3Carl E. Seashore, The Junior College Movement (New York, 1940), pp. 5-6.

that the current curricula of these institutions are not designed to serve the educational needs and interests of this large group of young people.  

Review of Related Studies

Contact with personnel in several states, local administrators, research centers and libraries revealed that authoritative published research on the development of community and junior college programs for management training is practically nonexistent. Although a limited amount of research has been done in the area of post-secondary distributive education, the members of the National Association of Management Educators insist (by the choice of the organization's name), however, that management training in the United States includes much more than just post-secondary distributive education. Since this emerging field has yet to conduct and publish its research, closely related research is reported in the fields of general occupational education and in post-secondary distributive education.

Bowman,6 in his study of Iowa public junior colleges, found that of Iowa's 1963 high school seniors, more than

5Ibid., p. 13.

one-third planned to seek less-than-baccalaureate-degree training. He found that better than ten per cent of the seniors planned to take technical-vocational courses. Employers' responses indicated that these junior colleges were not providing appropriate training opportunities for the needs of semi-skilled, technical, or skilled employees.

Rippey\textsuperscript{7} studied New Mexico's community colleges to determine if the university branch system of junior colleges are meeting the educational needs of the state. He found that there were no provisions for terminal credit courses. Adult education and community service courses were lacking. He determined that the university extension programs were not capable of meeting the need for comprehensive community colleges.

Busher,\textsuperscript{8} in 1961, surveyed twenty-nine community colleges in seven states and found that the Associate of Arts degree is being offered in twenty-six of them. The Associate of Commerce was offered in two. Considerable


attention is given to general education, and thirteen vocational courses are offered by one or more colleges.

Martin,9 in 1952, studied practices of junior colleges in California to promote and maintain merchandising programs. He used literature, personal contact, and questionnaires answered by school personnel. He found that coordinators rely on their own work experience as an important source of information. He found that work experience is considered necessary for students by all administrators, and that when objectives for programs were being formulated, merchants and employees were usually not consulted.

In 1960, Carver10 studied the Junior Colleges of California to examine changes in curriculum of distributive education from 1938 to 1958. He found that there had been an increase from a single course offering to several curriculums. Merchandising remained a popular curriculum, with business operation and management in second place.


Two studies concerned with curriculum evaluation in post-secondary distributive education were found. Corbman\(^{11}\) (1958) surveyed the graduates of the Retail Distribution Department of the New York Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences for the period 1947 through 1953 to determine what curriculum revisions should be made. Findings were favorable to the existing curriculums. The study showed that the program achieved its objectives, that the competencies were useful, and that cooperative training was helpful.

In 1965, Henkel\(^{12}\) followed up graduates of the two-year marketing programs in Wisconsin during the period 1960 through 1963. His findings indicated that the courses most often recommended by the graduates for addition to the marketing curriculum were speech, additional English, buying, and mathematics. The investigator suggested a follow-up of employers to get their reactions, greater choice of elective subjects, and, for students who want it, on-the-job training.


Included in the Bibliography is a list of selected studies used in a survey of related research. Almost all of these studies involved only retailing programs.

Griffitts\textsuperscript{13} (1967) studied the business program objectives of the public community colleges. He identified and validated eight curriculum objectives. These were then evaluated by college presidents and business department heads as to their value to the junior college business departments. Variables were positions held, geographic region and institutional size. He found that college presidents and business department heads ranked the transfer objective as the one most important to the business programs in the public community colleges. Using institution size as a variable, he found close agreement on the ranking of importance of objectives. Using geographic region as a variable, he found wide disagreement as to the importance of some of the objectives.

Griffitts did extensive work in identifying and validating the eight curriculum objectives used in his study. Permission was granted the researcher by Dr. Griffitts to use or adapt any or all of these objectives to this study. Five

\textsuperscript{13}Griffitts, op. cit.
of them were adapted for use in studying the management training programs within the business departments.

Huckabee, in 1969, conducted a national survey of management training courses in two-year colleges in the United States to determine the names of courses offered and the textbooks used in these courses. Questionnaires were submitted to 500, all known program directors of marketing, retailing, and mid-management in community colleges, area vocational-technical schools, and technical institutes. Responses indicated a preference of management seminars five to one as compared with marketing seminars; business psychology or human relations seminars ranked almost five to one over marketing seminars. Since the peculiar identities of these programs rest in the work-related seminars, this study indicated a strong redirection of these programs toward management and the human relations aspects of management and a rapidly declining need for specialized retailing or distributive programs.

Summary

The community college has, as an institution, been studied through increasing research. However, practically none of this research was directly centered upon the vocational management training programs. Although the identity of these programs are often merged with post-secondary distributive education, many distinctive qualities have emerged that invalidates the title distributive education for these programs. They involve all types of management training, not just training in distribution.

Review of the literature shows a progression from a strictly transfer program for the two-year colleges of fifty years ago to the multi-curricula institutions of today, with vocational education playing an important role in serving local community needs. In view of the many management training programs emerging in these institutions, the lack of literature and research concerning them certainly indicates an urgent need for study in this field.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Procedures for Collection of Data

Development of questionnaires* for the collection of the responses by state vocational directors, instructors, and business leaders was the first step in gathering the data. Validity of each item for the questionnaire was determined through consultation with local business leaders and educators. Each item received approval from six out of eight of these consultants to remain in the questionnaire. Both the individual items and the instrument as a whole were discussed in personal interviews with these several consultants, and the resulting questionnaire forms thus represent a broad base of professional judgment.

*Permission was received by the investigator to use or adapt for this study the copyrighted objectives and questionnaires used by Griffitts in the study cited in footnote number 4, Chapter I.
After the validity of the questionnaires for this study had been established, a panel of 140 business leaders were asked to determine, by scoring one form of the questionnaire, the types of managers needed by the business community. These experts were asked to indicate what types of managers they believed these programs should provide. Questionnaires were mailed to 140 names selected at random from the committee list (made up of more than 1,000 names) of the 1969 American Management Association annual report.

A second form of the questionnaire was mailed to all fifty state directors of vocational education in the United States asking for information and an expression of their views on vocational management programs in two-year colleges. Information was sought on the importance placed presently and desired in the future on five objectives of these programs.

Questionnaires were mailed to a selected group of 188 instructors throughout the nation, who were asked to

*Careful study was given to the selection of an appropriate group of business leaders. Authorities consulted, including Dr. Haswell, Research Specialist with the U. S. office of HEW, and Professor Henry L. Sisk of North Texas State University, agreed that the broad field of business management represented by the American Management Association and their interest in management education justified the choice of this group.
describe not only the current management training programs in their institution, but also the desired future direction of these programs.

A personally typed follow-up letter, with another copy of the questionnaire, was sent to persons who did not return the initial questionnaire within two weeks.

Procedures for Treatment of Data

All responses received before the cut-off date were included in the study. The data furnished by each of the respondents were key punched, and a computer program written for analysis of the data.

All data were tabulated on computer sheets according to the evaluation of each objective by each group. A simple analysis of variance was computed to indicate whether or not significant differences existed between the perceptions held by the three groups concerning evaluation of each objective. The computation of the simple analysis of variance, through Duncan's New Multiple Range Test, was the basis for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses at the .05 level of confidence.

Table I shows research inquiries, number of responses, and the percentage responding by group.
TABLE I
RESEARCH INQUIRIES AND RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Sent</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Per Cent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Vocational Directors</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Leaders</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

As stated in Chapter One, the research hypotheses for this study concern the differences in perceptions held by representative business leaders, instructors of management training programs and state vocational directors pertaining to management training programs in two-year colleges in the United States.

The statistical technique used in the treatment of the data was basically a simple analysis of variance. When a significant F ratio was found, Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was used to signify where the difference lies.

The tables and illustrations which follow present the findings which the study revealed. Illustrations give composite views of all responses. Tables II and III summarize the rankings of mean perceptions held by all three groups queried of the present and desired future importance of the following curriculum objectives: supplemental training, technical, semi-professional, retraining, and transfer.
Tables IV through IX present analyses of data related to the six hypotheses, giving the mean differences, range product, and significant differences between the respective perceptions held by the responding groups.

The complete data upon which these findings are based were submitted to the Computer Center at North Texas State University; there an analysis of variance was run to find significant differences between groups.

Figure 1 gives a composite view of all responses, comparing present importance with future importance of five curriculum objectives. Each objective increased in importance for the future, with retraining showing the greatest future increase by far, causing it to step up in rank over semi-professional. These findings are further studied in the following tables.

Table II gives the ranking of the curriculum objectives based on their present importance as perceived by all three responding groups. Ranks were determined by the value of the mean for each objective based on all responses, using a one-to-five scale.

As shown by Table II, supplemental training is considered the most important objective of the management training programs in the public community colleges today.
Fig. 1—Mean stated perceptions of present and future importance of five curriculum objectives of 207 respondents. (Means as rated on a 1-5 scale.)
TABLE II
RANK OF MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF PRESENT IMPORTANCE OF CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES BASED ON DATA FROM 207 RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mean on 1-5 Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supplemental Training</td>
<td>3.8744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>3.8068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Semi-Professional</td>
<td>3.6860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Retraining</td>
<td>3.4155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>3.1643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The technical and semi-professional objectives rank closely behind, followed by retraining and transfer.

Table III indicates the increasing importance which the three groups give to the retraining objective in the future management training curriculum in the two-year colleges in the United States.

TABLE III
RANK OF MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF DESIRED FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES BASED ON DATA FROM 207 RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mean on 1-5 Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supplemental Training</td>
<td>4.1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>4.0725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Retraining</td>
<td>3.8986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Semi-Professional</td>
<td>3.7585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>3.2126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The retraining objective moved up from fourth to third position, exchanging places with the semi-professional objective. Table III also shows that the arithmetic mean, as determined on the one-to-five scale, increased substantially for desired future importance over that of the present importance for each of the five curriculum objectives.

Figures 2 and 3 compare stated perceptions of the three groups on each of the curriculum objectives for both present and future importance. These figures illustrate objective ranks and degrees of difference. They indicate areas of significant differences.

By studying Figures 2 and 3, each group's ranking of the five objectives can be analyzed. They show that the perceptions held by instructors lie at a point between the valuations of the other two groups for each objective, except for supplemental training present and future, on which the three groups closely agree.

Significant differences between state vocational directors and business leaders occur on each objective, except supplemental training on which they agree almost perfectly, with instructors falling low, but not significantly so, in their valuation. State vocational directors and business leaders seem to have a closer understanding of this one objective than do instructors and business leaders.
Fig. 2—Mean perceptions stated by each of the three groups on the five curriculum objectives as to present importance. (Means as rated on a 1-5 scale.)
Fig. 3—Mean perceptions stated by each of the three groups on the five curriculum objectives as to future importance.

- # State Vocational Directors
- * Instructors
- △ Business Leaders
Figure 4 shows perceptions held by all three groups concerning the importance of five curriculum objectives for both present and future.

This illustration shows the increasing future importance of each curriculum objective; it also depicts the middle position held by instructors. The patterns, both within groups and among groups, make interesting observations. Deserving special study is the close agreement by all groups on the supplemental training objective and the heavy emphasis given by business leaders, causing this objective to climb to first place.

The low value placed by business leaders on the semi-professional objective, both present and future, shows a very wide difference from the perceptions held by educators. Again, a great difference exists on the transfer objective. Business leaders hold to their statement about the present importance for their future predictions. They indicate that individual potential should be the limitation, not previous forms of education, while educators indicate that vocational education itself is a limiting factor for the individual shown by their low rating for the transfer objective.
State Vocational Directors (Future Importance)
Instructors (Future Importance)
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Fig. 1 - Mean perceptions of importance
Findings Concerning Hypothesis 1

Table IV summarizes the information needed to test the first hypothesis of this study that there is a significant difference between the perceptions held by a national panel of business leaders and those perceptions held by state vocational directors on the present importance of each of several curriculum objectives.

The present importance of each of the five objectives as perceived by the state vocational directors is compared with the present importance of these objectives as revealed by the mean responses of the business leaders. Significant differences of means are readily apparent.

Significant differences were found in the means of four of the five curriculum objectives as rated by the two groups, the state vocational directors and the business leaders. The two groups disagreed on the present importance of the following curriculum objectives: semi-professional, technical, retraining, and transfer. The state vocational directors and business leaders were in near agreement in their ranking of the present importance of the supplemental training objective.

Thus, the first hypothesis is valid in most of its contentions. Of the five objectives compared, only one,
### TABLE IV

**COMPARISON OF STATED PERCEPTIONS OF 65 BUSINESS LEADERS AND 40 STATE VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS CONCERNING THE PRESENT IMPORTANCE OF EACH OF FIVE CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) State Vocational Directors</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) Business Leaders</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Range Product</th>
<th>Level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Professional</td>
<td>4.00000</td>
<td>3.15385</td>
<td>0.84615</td>
<td>0.48533</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>4.22500</td>
<td>3.66154</td>
<td>0.56346</td>
<td>0.44160</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Training</td>
<td>4.00000</td>
<td>4.03077</td>
<td>0.03077</td>
<td>0.45337</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraining</td>
<td>3.87500</td>
<td>3.10769</td>
<td>0.76731</td>
<td>0.52709</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>2.65000</td>
<td>3.70769</td>
<td>1.05769</td>
<td>0.52778</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If the mean difference exceeds the range product value, the means are significantly different at the .05 level of confidence or better.*
supplemental training, fails to show significant differences in the present importance attached to it by vocational directors and business leaders.

Findings Concerning Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis Two of this study is tested through information summarized in Table V. This hypothesis stated that there is a significant difference between the perceptions held by a national panel of business leaders and those perceptions held by state vocational directors on the desired future importance of each of several curriculum objectives.

In the rated desired future importance of the five curriculum objectives as viewed by the state vocational directors and business leaders, significant differences were found in four of them—semi-professional, technical, retraining, and transfer. Thus, Hypothesis Two is rejected only for the supplemental training objective. This is the only one that did not show a significant difference of opinion concerning its desired future importance as seen by state vocational directors and business leaders.

Findings Concerning Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis Three of this study, tested by data summarized in Table VI, states that there is a significant difference
TABLE V

COMPARISON OF STATED PERCEPTIONS OF 65 BUSINESS LEADERS AND 40 STATE VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS CONCERNING THE DESIRED FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF EACH OF FIVE OBJECTIVES OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) State Vocational Directors</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) Business Leaders</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Range Product</th>
<th>Level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Professional</td>
<td>4.25000</td>
<td>3.03077</td>
<td>1.21923</td>
<td>0.49468</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>4.50000</td>
<td>3.80000</td>
<td>0.70000</td>
<td>0.45141</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Training</td>
<td>4.32500</td>
<td>4.20000</td>
<td>0.12500</td>
<td>0.41718</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraining</td>
<td>4.32500</td>
<td>3.58461</td>
<td>0.74039</td>
<td>0.47798</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>2.90000</td>
<td>3.69231</td>
<td>0.79231</td>
<td>0.57211</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If the mean difference exceeds the range product value, the means are significantly different at the .05 level of confidence or better.
### TABLE VI

**COMPARISON OF STATED PERCEPTIONS OF 65 BUSINESS LEADERS AND 102 INSTRUCTORS CONCERNING THE PRESENT IMPORTANCE OF EACH OF THE FIVE CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) Business Leaders</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) Instructors</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Range Product</th>
<th>Level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Professional</td>
<td>3.15385</td>
<td>3.90196</td>
<td>0.74811</td>
<td>0.36412</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>3.66154</td>
<td>3.73529</td>
<td>0.07376</td>
<td>0.33131</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Training</td>
<td>4.03077</td>
<td>3.72549</td>
<td>0.30528</td>
<td>0.37691</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraining</td>
<td>3.10769</td>
<td>3.43137</td>
<td>0.32368</td>
<td>0.39544</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>3.70769</td>
<td>3.01961</td>
<td>0.68808</td>
<td>0.39596</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If the mean difference exceeds the range product value, the means are significantly different at the .05 level of confidence or better.
between perceptions held by a national panel of business leaders and those perceptions held by instructors on the present importance of each of several curriculum objectives.

Significant differences of opinion were found regarding the present importance of only two of the five objectives—the semi-professional and the transfer, so for these the hypothesis is accepted.

The findings shown in Table VI demonstrate that significant differences do not exist concerning the way in which business leaders and instructors view the relative importance of the technical, supplemental training, and retraining objectives of management training programs, and the hypothesis is rejected for them.

Findings Concerning Hypothesis 4

Table VII presents the results of the data gathered for testing the fourth hypothesis. It states that there is a significant difference between perceptions held by a national panel of business leaders and those perceptions held by instructors on the desired future importance of each of several curriculum objectives.

The results of the responses concerning Hypothesis Four showed that there were significant differences in the way
TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF STATED PERCEPTIONS OF 65 BUSINESS LEADERS AND 102 INSTRUCTORS CONCERNING THE DESIRED FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF EACH OF FIVE CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) Business Leaders</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) Instructors</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Range Product</th>
<th>Level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mi-Professional</td>
<td>3.03077</td>
<td>4.02941</td>
<td>0.99864</td>
<td>0.37113</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>3.80000</td>
<td>4.07843</td>
<td>0.27843</td>
<td>0.33866</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plemental Training</td>
<td>4.20000</td>
<td>4.05882</td>
<td>0.14118</td>
<td>0.32947</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td>3.58461</td>
<td>3.93137</td>
<td>0.34676</td>
<td>0.35860</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nsfer</td>
<td>3.69231</td>
<td>3.02941</td>
<td>0.66290</td>
<td>0.42922</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If the mean difference exceeds the range product value, the means are significantly different at the .05 level of confidence or better.
business leaders and instructors regarded the future desired importance of only two of the five objectives—the semi-professional and the transfer, for which the hypothesis was retained.

Hypothesis Four was rejected for the technical, supplementary, and retraining curriculum objectives, since the responses showed the business leaders and instructors to be in basic agreement in these areas.

Findings Concerning Hypothesis 5

Presented in Table VIII are data used to test Hypothesis Five of this study. It states that there is a significant difference in the perceptions held by state vocational directors and instructors on the present importance of each of the management training program objectives.

The only significant difference between the two groups was found in comparing perceptions concerning the present importance of the technical curriculum objective to the management training programs in the two-year colleges in the United States. So the hypothesis was retained for this one objective and rejected for the other four, as no significant differences were found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) State Vocational Directors</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) Instructors</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Range Product</th>
<th>Level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Professional</td>
<td>4.00000</td>
<td>3.90196</td>
<td>0.09804</td>
<td>0.42804</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>4.22500</td>
<td>3.73529</td>
<td>0.48971</td>
<td>0.38944</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Training</td>
<td>4.00000</td>
<td>3.72549</td>
<td>0.27451</td>
<td>0.42088</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraining</td>
<td>3.87500</td>
<td>3.43137</td>
<td>0.44363</td>
<td>0.46483</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>2.65000</td>
<td>3.01961</td>
<td>0.36961</td>
<td>0.46544</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If the mean difference exceeds the range product value, the means are significantly different at the .05 level of confidence or better.
Findings Concerning Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis Six is tested against data presented in Table IX. It states that there is a significant difference in the perceptions held by state vocational directors and instructors on the desired future importance of each curriculum objective.

The hypothesis is proved valid only in regard to the technical curriculum objective, where a significant difference between the means of group responses is evident.

For the semi-professional, supplemental training, retraining, and transfer objectives, the hypothesis was rejected, as no significant differences were found.
### TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF STATED PERCEPTIONS OF 40 STATE VOCATIONAL DIRECTORS AND 102 INSTRUCTORS CONCERNING THE DESIRED FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF EACH OF THE FIVE CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) State Vocational Directors</th>
<th>Mean (1-5 Scale) Instructors</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Range Product</th>
<th>Level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hi-Professional</td>
<td>4.25000</td>
<td>4.02941</td>
<td>0.22059</td>
<td>0.43625</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>4.50000</td>
<td>4.07843</td>
<td>0.42157</td>
<td>0.39809</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plemental Training</td>
<td>4.32500</td>
<td>4.05882</td>
<td>0.26618</td>
<td>0.40768</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td>4.32500</td>
<td>3.93137</td>
<td>0.39363</td>
<td>0.42153</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ansfer</td>
<td>2.90000</td>
<td>3.02941</td>
<td>0.12941</td>
<td>0.50454</td>
<td>No SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If the mean difference exceeds the range product value, the means are significantly different at the .05 level of confidence or better.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions held by three significant groups concerning management training programs in two-year colleges in the United States on the present and desired future importance of these curriculum objectives: semi-professional, technical, supplemental, retraining and transfer. The perceptions were determined by analyses of responses to questionnaires sent to representative members of each of three groups.

The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire by means of which group members were asked to rate, on a one-to-five scale, the present and desired future importance of five curriculum objectives to the management training programs in two-year colleges in the United States. The validity of the questionnaire was established. Representative samples of the three groups completed the questionnaire; 40 state vocational directors, 65 business leaders, and
A simple analysis of variance was computed from the collected data to test the hypotheses that there were significant differences between the perceptions held by each pair of the three groups of respondents. Of the thirty comparisons made to test the hypotheses, fourteen had F-ratios which were significant at greater than the .05 level, indicating significant differences between the three groups.

Summary of the Findings

The first four findings, listed below, are based on the analysis of all responses from the nationwide survey. The final three findings resulting from tests of the hypotheses are given.

1. The most important objective to the management training programs in the two-year colleges in the United States today and in the future is to provide supplemental training.

2. The objective rated second in importance, both at present and in the future, is technical training.

3. The semi-professional objective ranks third in present importance, but drops to fourth in desired future importance, exchanging positions with retraining.
4. Although the transfer objective ranks last in both present and desired future importance, its mean is high, 3.1643 for the present, and increases to 3.2126 for desired future importance.

5. Tests of Hypotheses One and Two revealed significant differences between group perceptions for four of the five curriculum objectives. The responses of state vocational directors were compared with those of the business leaders on present and desired future importance of curriculum objectives. The greatest number of disagreements were found between these groups. Of ten comparisons, differences of significance were found in eight.

6. Hypotheses Three and Four were tested for significant differences in perceptions reflected in responses between business leaders and instructors on the present and desired future importance of the five curriculum objectives to management training programs in the United States. Of the ten comparisons, significant differences were found in four.

7. Tests of Hypotheses Five and Six checked for significant differences in perceptions reflected in responses between state vocational directors and instructors on the present and desired future importance of the five curriculum
objectives to management training programs in the two-year colleges in the United States. Only two significant differences were found in the ten comparisons.

Conclusions

1. Based on the findings, it appears that both present and desired future program objectives are diverse and multiple. Each objective's importance is seen as being greater in the future.

These college programs will increasingly provide the appropriate occupational training for adults, as both the supplemental and the retraining objective apply to people who are already, or have been, in the labor force.

2. Differences in perceptions exist between state vocational directors and business leaders concerning present and desired future importance of curriculum objectives to the rapidly emerging management training programs in the two-year colleges in the United States. There exists a communication gap here which raises some questions.

3. Instructors appear to have a better understanding of, and to be not so remote from, the requirements for employment opportunities of their students than do state vocational directors.
They had only one-half as many differences with business leaders as state vocational directors had.

4. State vocational directors and instructors have a closer agreement with each other on present and desired future importance of the five curriculum objectives than they have with business leaders.

Implications

The extent of any significant differences in perceptions of program purposes held by these three groups reflects inefficiency, confusion, and dispersion of energy in the programs. If effective meaningful training is to be provided for the students, it seems only reasonable that the people responsible for administering the funds, writing state vocational plans, supervising, instructing, and coordinating these programs should be able to reach a clear definition of the curriculum requirements the students must have to be most employable.

Does the fact that business leaders ranked present importance of supplemental training higher than the other two groups give an indication of a higher sensitivity and a quicker response to changing employment needs? Educators sensed the changing role of more emphasis here for the junior college of the future. If business leaders' judgments can be assumed to be reliable, educators over reacted for the future, but
failed to give as much present value as did business leaders. That all three groups saw substantial future increases and that differences among these groups were not significant suggest that supplemental training is now and will continue to be the most important curriculum objective to management training programs in the two-year colleges.

The combined scores of the three groups place technical training second and showed a substantial increase for the future. The instructors' rank fell between the other groups', as usual, but near business leaders for both present and future importance. Does the extremely high ranking of this objective by state vocational directors indicate that they are seeing these programs through different eyes and giving priorities to the technical programs that are higher than either business leaders or instructors can visualize? Is this an area for additional research?

The wide range of priorities, especially the very low one given by business leaders for semi-professional objectives for both present and future, show that the educators are expecting different employment opportunities than business leaders can see. Why do business leaders rank semi-professional as least important for the future?
The climb in rank for retraining in the future reflects great increases indicated by all three groups, but state vocational directors seem to be over reacting again to the actual need, as both their present and future valuations are so high as to cause significant difference with business leaders, while instructors seem to be more sensitive to a realistic increase. Do business leaders plan to do some of the retraining themselves?

Why do state vocational directors rate the transfer objective so very low when business leaders are saying that we must develop each individual to his potential even if he did start out in vocational education; he should be given a bridge to further higher education if he needs and desires it, not be fenced in on a one-way street. Is there a lingering dichotomy in the minds of educators between vocational education and academic education that business leaders find unthinkable? Are instructors influenced by this low rating by state vocational directors which conflicts with the opportunities offered by business leaders?

Does the fact that instructors' perceptions lie at a point between state vocational directors and business leaders on each objective, except for supplemental training where the difference was small, indicate that instructors have a
more realistic view of program priorities than do the other two groups, or at least more than state vocational directors have?

Recommendations

The following suggestions are based on the findings of the nationwide survey and study of management training programs in the two-year colleges in the United States.

1. All concerned should encourage research in these emerging programs.

2. More instructor time should be allocated to business community communication, and feedback provided to state vocational directors.

3. More program decision making should be decentralized to local instructors.

4. Instructors should be more involved in program planning and advising as they seem to have a better understanding of the business opportunities for their students.

5. Instructors should be allowed to perform the major role in formulating state guidelines, keeping them flexible to accommodate desired diversity of programs.

6. State vocational directors should utilize local advisory boards as an important functioning source of information by use of surveys, reports, and meetings through local
instructors. Local advisory board members should be invited to attend state workshop sessions, taking an active part in program planning.

7. Pressures for program directions should be examined in the light of possible reasons for such pressures; for example, why are pressures being applied to limit management training to the retail or distributive areas?

8. A clear separate identity of these programs as vocational management training programs should be made on a national, state, and local level.

9. The three groups need to communicate, engage in dialogue and in research, and attempt to realign objective priorities to assure that the students' best interests are served in our dynamic society.

10. Communication among people in the field of vocational education, as well as with those outside the field, is limited by inadequate definition of terms. This study is handicapped because of the inability of the reader to have commonality of terms used. Terminology of vocational education should be clearly defined. Perhaps the technical objective should be defined as job-related skills required for actual performance of a specific job.
Recommendations for Further Research

1. A constant re-examination of objectives is necessary to determine if they are meeting the changing occupational mix necessary for our dynamic society.

2. Research is needed to determine if the objective ranked most important, supplemental training, is being kept flexible enough to serve the wide occupational needs of the majority of the students.

3. Since all three groups indicate future increases for the technical objective (the state vocational directors' increase was so high it differed significantly from the other two groups), research should be conducted to determine the most feasible rate of increase and in which technical directions to go. Does industry plan to do some of this training?

4. Research is needed to determine why educators rank the semi-professional objective so much higher than business leaders, who ranked it as least important for the future.

5. Research should be conducted to determine the impact on perceptions held by the following factors: length of time in classroom, length of time since working in classroom, educational background, geographic area, and type of managerial role played by the business leaders.
6. The communication network among and within the three groups should be studied in depth to determine its extent and effectiveness.

7. This study was necessarily confined to program objectives, but research is also needed as to the substance of vocational management training. Analysis of the judgments of significant groups concerning the content and techniques of the programs, with reference to the types of managers they produce, would be meaningful.
APPENDIX
January 28, 1970

TO STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION:

Post-secondary programs in Texas, under the general title of Marketing and Distribution, are currently in a state of continuing development. Many sub-programs in this general area are currently being developed and offered. Needless to say, many interpretations have been placed upon the importance of these types of programs. In fact, in many instances, the objectives of the programs themselves have been seriously questioned.

June Huckabee, Assistant Professor in Business Administration at Tarrant County Junior College, is currently conducting a study that should prove to be beneficial to all schools offering programs in the Marketing and Distribution area. Obviously, she will require a great deal of cooperation from individuals connected with vocational post-secondary education.

I would personally appreciate any assistance that you find possible to offer in connection with this study. Completion of the questionnaire would help in the formal part of her study; however, any information that you feel will be helpful should be sent to her.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation in this educational endeavor.

Sincerely,

John R. Guemple
Associate Commissioner for
Occupational Education and Technology

JRG:JDG:cb
Post-secondary programs in Texas, under the general title of Marketing and Distribution, are currently in a state of continuing development. Many sub-programs in this general area are currently being developed and offered. Needless to say, many interpretations have been placed upon the importance of these types of programs. In fact, in many instances, the objectives of the programs themselves have been seriously questioned.

June Huckabee, Assistant Professor in Business Administration at Tarrant County Junior College, is currently conducting a study that should prove to be beneficial to all schools offering programs in the Marketing and Distribution area. Obviously, she will require a great deal of cooperation from individuals connected with vocational post-secondary education.

I would personally appreciate any assistance that you find possible to offer in connection with this study. Completion of the questionnaire would help in the formal part of her study; however, any information that you feel will be helpful should be sent to her.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation in this educational endeavor.

Sincerely,

John R. Guemple
Associate Commissioner for
Occupational Education and Technology

JRG:JDG:cb
Dear Business Leader:

I am writing to ask for your assistance in a nation-wide study of management training programs at the two-year college level. Specifically, I am asking you to evaluate the importance of certain curriculum objectives in terms of employment opportunities, both presently and in the future, for graduates of these programs.

A composite summary of perceptions held by a representative group of your colleagues in business management will be used as a basis for a study of our current programs.

As a token expression of my appreciation for your assistance, a summary of the findings of this study will be sent to you upon completion.

Your cooperation in scoring and returning the enclosed questionnaire will enhance the value of this research project to curriculum developers, instructors, students, and to the communities employing them.

Sincerely yours,

June Huckabee, Assistant Professor
Business Administration

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE

[Signature]

[Enclosure]
PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING OBJECTIVES OF
TWO-YEAR COLLEGE VOCATIONAL MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

Management training programs in public community colleges can be directed toward several potentially useful objectives: five such objectives have been defined and chosen for this study.

The attached questionnaire describes these objectives. You are asked to respond to each of the following questions for each of the objectives:

(Column 1)
In terms of your own industry and in terms of the industrial sector which you represent, what do you wish the two-year colleges to do to meet present employment needs in management? Please describe the complex of objectives which you believe should currently be met by these colleges by circling one number in column 1 for each objective.

(Column 2)
Considering the impact of advancing technology and the dynamic environment of business, what do you foresee employment needs in management in your own industrial community to be in the future? In column 2, circle a number for each objective which represents your opinion of its importance in the two-year college program of the future (e.g., in 1980).

Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Permission has been received to use or adapt for this study questionnaires used by Horace F. Griffiths in his Doctor's thesis completed at Michigan State University in 1967.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE VOCATIONAL MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM</th>
<th>What degree of importance do you presently place on each of the objectives stated at the left? (Circle one number)</th>
<th>What degree of importance do you believe will be placed on each objective ten years in the future? (Circle one number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Produce, with a two-year curriculum, managers who seek SEMI-PROFESSIONAL positions at the supervisory or middle management levels upon completion of the program. The curriculum would consist of approximately equal amounts of general education and technical courses.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Produce, with a two-year curriculum, managers who seek positions which are best defined as TECHNICAL. The curriculum would consist of one-fourth to one-third general education, remainder primarily concentrated in a technical area. (Technical - pertaining to technical performance of a job)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide courses for persons who are recently employed but who need INCREMENTAL TRAINING for advancement in their present occupational field. The curriculum would consist of courses based on the needs of a specific occupational area in the needs of a specific industry.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide courses or curricula of varying lengths for persons who must have TRAINING in order to enter new occupational fields. The curriculum content will be based upon the ability level of the trainees as well as the existing needs of a local or regional labor market.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Produce, with a two-year curriculum, managers who plan to TRANSFER to senior colleges to complete the baccalaureate degree. The curriculum would consist of one courses, primarily general education, that normally constitute the first two years of the undergraduate degree.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Somewhat Not Important Important Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Educator:

Your assistance is requested in gathering information for a dissertation study in the area of vocational post-secondary education. Those programs are being studied which are listed in the U. S. Office of Health, Education, and Welfare report for 1968, under Distributive Education: Management (general), Marketing, Mid-Management, and other vocational programs generally known as management training.

As this is an emerging educational field, sometimes poorly defined and subject to differing interpretations in importance of objectives, a sharing of information through a national study should be of mutual benefit to all implementing these programs.

Will you please help in this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire, and sending any other information you desire. As a token expression of my appreciation for your assistance you will receive a summary of the findings of this study upon its completion.

Yours very truly,

June Huckabees, Assistant Professor
Business Administration
TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE
PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE OBJECTIVES OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE VOCATIONAL MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

Management training programs in public community colleges can be directed toward several potentially useful objectives; five such objectives have been defined and chosen for this study.

The first page of the questionnaire is provided to solicit your perceptions of the present and the future importance of each of the stated objectives.

(Column 1)
In terms of your own industrial community and in terms of the industrial sector which it represents, what do you wish the two-year colleges to do to meet present employment needs in management? What degree of importance do you presently place on each objective?

(Column 2)
Considering the impact of advancing technology and the dynamic environment of business, what do you foresee employment needs in management in your own industrial community will be in the future? What degree of importance do you believe will be placed on each objective ten years in the future?

The second page of the questionnaire is provided to gather information concerning your institution's present and desired future emphasis on each objective as measured by faculty time allocation.

(Column 1)
To what extent, according to faculty time allocation, does your institution presently emphasize each of the types of curriculum content described?

(Column 2)
To what extent would you want your institution to emphasize, ten years from now, each of the types of curriculum content described?

Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Permission has been received to use or adapt for this study the copyrighted objectives and questionnaires used by Horace F. Griffits in his Doctor's thesis completed at Michigan State University in 1967.
<p>| OBJECTIVES OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE VOCATIONAL | What degree of importance do you | What degree of importance do you |
| UNIVERSITY TRAINING PROGRAMS | presently place on each of the | believes will be placed on each |
| | objectives stated at the left? | objective ten years in the future? |
| | (Circle one number) | (Circle one number) |
| 1. produce, with a two-year curriculum, | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important |
| | imgers who seek SKILL-PROFESSIONAL | Very | Somewhat | Not | Very | Somewhat | Not |
| | positions at the supervise or middle | | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important |
| | management levels upon completion of the | | | | | | |
| | program. The curriculum should consist of | | | | | | |
| | approximately equal amounts of general | | | | | | |
| | education and business courses. | | | | | | |
| 2. produce, with a two-year curriculum, | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important |
| | imgers who seek positions which are best | Very | Somewhat | Not | Very | Somewhat | Not |
| | defined as TECHNICAL. The curriculum would | | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important |
| | consist of one-fifth to one-third general | | | | | | |
| | education, remainder primarily concentrated | | | | | | |
| | in a technical area. (Technical—pertaining | | | | | | |
| | to technical performance of a job). | | | | | | |
| 3. provide courses for persons who are | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | currently employed but who need | Very | Somewhat | Not | Very | Somewhat | Not |
| | PREVAILING TRAINING for advancement | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important |
| | in their present occupational field. The | | | | | | |
| | curriculum would consist of courses based | | | | | | |
| | on the needs of a specific occupational area | | | | | | |
| | and the needs of a specific industry. | | | | | | |
| 4. provide courses or curricula of varying | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | lengths for persons who must have | Very | Somewhat | Not | Very | Somewhat | Not |
| | TRAINING in order to enter new | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important |
| | occupational fields. The curriculum content | | | | | | |
| | could be based upon the ability level of the | | | | | | |
| | applicant as well as the existing needs of | | | | | | |
| | a local or regional labor market. | | | | | | |
| 5. produce, with a two-year curriculum, | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | imgers who plan to TRAINING to senior | Very | Somewhat | Not | Very | Somewhat | Not |
| | degrees to complete the baccalaureate | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important | Important |
| | area. The curriculum would consist of | | | | | | |
| | core courses, primarily general education, | | | | | | |
| | which normally constitute the first two | | | | | | |
| | years of the undergraduate degree. | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRICULUM CONTENT FOR EACH OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>To what extent, according to faculty time allocated, does your institution presently emphasize each of the types of curriculum content described on the left? (Circle one percentage)</th>
<th>To what extent would you want your institution to emphasize, ten years from now, each of the types of curriculum content described on the left? (Circle one percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL: Approximately equal counts of general education (behavioral science emphasis) and business (management or marketing emphasis).</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL: One-fourth to one-third general education; remainder primarily concentrated in one of the technical areas.</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL: Special courses should be based on the needs of a specific occupational area or the needs of a specific industry.</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING: Content is based on the skill level of the retrainees as well as the existing needs of the local or regional labor market.</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED: These courses, primarily general education, which normally constitute the first two years of the undergraduate business degree.</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
<td>100  75  50  25  0  Percentage allocation of faculty time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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