

1985

A Follow-up of Distributive Education Graduates at Old Dominion University 1969-1984

Debra Carroll Rollins
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots_masters_projects



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rollins, Debra Carroll, "A Follow-up of Distributive Education Graduates at Old Dominion University 1969-1984" (1985). *OTS Master's Level Projects & Papers*. 454.
http://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots_masters_projects/454

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the STEM Education & Professional Studies at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in OTS Master's Level Projects & Papers by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

A FOLLOW-UP OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION
GRADUATES AT OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
1969-1984

A Study Presented To The Faculty of
the School of Education
Old Dominion University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Education

by
Debra Carroll Rollins

LIST OF TABLES

| | page |
|---|------|
| 1. Percentage of Graduate Responses | 17 |
| 2. Additional Course Work Completed | 19 |
| 3. Employment Status of Graduates | 22 |
| 4. Graduate Employment Positions | 24 |
| 5. Graduates Interested in Forming an Alumni Association | 27 |
| 6. Salaries of Graduates | 29 |

This research paper was prepared by Debra Carroll Rollins under the direction of Dr. Malvern Miller in VTE 636, Problems in Education. It was submitted to the Graduate Program Director as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Science in Education.

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Malvern Miller
Advisor and Graduate
Program Director of
Vocational and Technical
Education

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher is extremely grateful to Dr. John Ritz for his professional and sincere guidance in this study. His friendly support and encouragement have seen me through this study.

My many thanks also to Dr. John Turner for his assistance with the follow-up questionnaire and the names and addresses of the graduates. I would also like to thank Dr. Malvern Miller for his assistance and guidance in my efforts to complete this study.

Finally, to my loving family for their love and their many hours of patience during the completion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Acknowledgement | ii |
| Table of Contents | iii |
| List of Tables | v |
| Chapter | |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| Statement of Problem | 2 |
| Research Objectives | 2 |
| Background and Significance | 3 |
| Limitations | 4 |
| Assumptions | 4 |
| Procedures | 4 |
| Definition of Terms | 5 |
| Summary | 6 |
| 2. Review of Literature | 7 |
| History of Distributive Education | 7 |
| Follow-Up Studies | 9 |
| Summary | 11 |
| 3. Methods and Procedures | 12 |
| Instrumentation | 12 |
| Population | 13 |
| Data Collection | 13 |
| Data Treatment | 14 |
| Summary | 14 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 4. Findings | 15 |
| Status of Distributive Education Graduates . | 16 |
| Summary | 26 |
| 5. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations . | 32 |
| Introduction | 32 |
| Summary | 32 |
| Conclusions | 33 |
| Recommendations | 35 |
| Bibliography | 38 |
| Appendices | 39 |
| A. Follow-up Questionnaire | 40 |
| B. Follow-up Letter | 42 |
| C. Second Follow-up Letter | 43 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Distributive Education is a vocational education program designed for students preparing for or engaged in the field of distributing goods and services to the public. It includes all retail, wholesale, and service occupations. Distributive Education offers preparatory instruction for students desiring to explore distribution as a career, seeking a broader knowledge of the principles of free enterprise, or building a broader knowledge for continuing education related to distribution. Its purpose is to provide vocational instruction for individuals already employed or preparing to enter those occupations followed by proprietors, managers, or employees in distribution (Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinator's Handbook, 1966, pg.3).

Distributive Education is presently called Marketing Education in the local high schools in Virginia and most of the high schools throughout the United States. In December 1979, the National Delegate Assembly voted to change the name of the Distributive Education Division to Marketing and Distributive Education. In the spring of 1985, the National Delegate Assembly voted again to change the name of Marketing and Distributive Education to Marketing Education.

In almost every high school in the United States, Marketing Education curriculum is currently being offered.

It is normally offered as a three year curriculum. The Marketing Education Teacher-Coordinator must have a current teaching certificate and have an endorsement in Marketing Education.

There are presently four Universities in Virginia preparing Marketing Education teachers for secondary school programs. Old Dominion University was the third University in Virginia to offer this major. Old Dominion University continues to call this program Distributive Education.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to follow-up the graduates of the Distributive Education program at Old Dominion University to determine graduates' current employment status, employment positions, and current salaries.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Through the follow-up study, data will be compiled toward answering the following questions.

1. To identify the current employment status of the Distributive Education graduates.
2. To determine the number and percentage of graduates in the teaching field.
3. To determine the number and percentage of graduates in the business and retailing fields.
4. To compute the average salaries of the graduates.

5. To determine the employment positions of the graduates.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The Distributive Education program at Old Dominion University is now in its sixteenth year. Since its establishment in 1968, there have been over two hundred and fifty teacher certified graduates from the program. If one reviews the state directory of Marketing Education Teacher-Coordinators, many of them have been Old Dominion University graduates. Many other graduates have entered other fields of business and retailing. One of the most effective indices of program quality is what happens to the graduates of the program after they have completed the instruction.

This is the first formal follow-up study of the graduates of the Distributive Education Program at Old Dominion University. In this day of accountability, it is mandatory that a program of study receive feedback. One of the best methods to receive feedback is contacting graduates of the program. The Advisory Council on Vocational Education, established in 1963, found that follow-up studies of students and their progress in the world of work were considered essential (Bloom, Hastings, Madaus, 1971, p. 860). A represented sample of all graduates should be contacted within a few years after completion of the program of study. After the initial follow-up, graduates are then

followed on a regular basis, for example every five years.

LIMITATIONS

The following limitations are:

1. Only teacher certified graduates of Distributive Education at Old Dominion University were studied.
2. Only graduates from 1969 through 1984 were included.
3. All graduates could not be located.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made in this study:

1. Some graduates of the Distributive Education program are working in business and retailing and other graduates are employed in education.
2. Employed respondents and non-respondents are employed in business, retailing, education and other employment fields.

PROCEDURES

A survey was developed to assist the researcher to obtain pertinent information. A clear, concise, and simple survey was used. Questions on the survey were in both open and closed format. Names and addresses were furnished by the Distributive Education and Vocational and Technical Education Departments. Surveys were mailed to all graduates with known addresses. A self-addressed stamped envelope was

provided to the graduates. Graduates that did not respond to the initial survey were contacted with a follow-up letter in addition to a duplicate survey. The total data collected from both the initial survey as well as the duplicate survey was tabulated and analyzed and the results were reported.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

To insure that the reader and researcher have a common understanding of terms, the following terms are defined:

1. Teacher-Coordinator- The Marketing Education teacher who is responsible for the total operation and effectiveness of the high school Marketing Education Program. This involves classroom instruction, job placement, and on-the-job supervision in cooperation with classroom instruction (Student Handbook, Norfolk Public Schools, Distributive Education, 1984, p. 6.2).

2. Graduate- Distributive Education graduate from Old Dominion University, School of Education from 1969 through 1984.

3. Business employees- Graduates employed in the field of business.

4. Education employees- Graduates employed in the field of education.

SUMMARY

This chapter introduced and presented the background information on the statement of the problem. It subsequently provided the problem and the goal of the study. The limitations, assumptions, and definition of terms were presented to help clarify this study. Finally, the procedures were summarized to provide direction for the study.

The succeeding chapters of this study will present a review of literature, following with the methods and procedures employed by this study. The fourth chapter will deal with the findings gathered by this study. The final and fifth chapter will discuss the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of this study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to provide continuity to this study, the literature in this section has been categorized into two specific areas of concentration. The first section will briefly cover the history of Distributive Education in Virginia and Old Dominion University, and the final section will cover relevant research on follow-up studies.

HISTORY OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

Education for distribution was not the accepted or traditional program of vocational education in 1937. The first step was taken in Virginia to start the program of Distributive Education when several businessmen in the small town of Waynesboro, Virginia began to realize that the majority of the town's weekly payroll was not remaining in the Waynesboro's cash registers. A committee was formed and requested the assistance of a retail specialist who through counseling and training, could assist the merchants with their problem of securing and retaining sales volume in Waynesboro.

Louise Bernard, who was then employed by R.H. Macy and Company, was asked to come to Waynesboro to conduct a three-month pilot program. It was at this time that the content and framework for the first Distributive Education adult program for store management and salespeople in

Virginia and the nation was developed. The success of the Waynesboro pilot program prompted an invitation to Ms. Bernard to join the State Department of Education Staff and to establish Distributive Education on a state-wide basis.

Before Ms. Bernard would accept the position at the state level, she urged the initiation of a teacher-education program. It was in 1937 when she established the first school in the nation for educating Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators. The school was established at the Richmond Professional Institute in Richmond, Virginia. Of the four programs in Virginia that are preparing students to become Marketing Education Teacher-Coordinators. Old Dominion University was the third University in Virginia to establish a program in 1968.

Distributive Education at Old Dominion University is a curriculum area located within the Department of Vocational and Technical Education. It originally began in the late 1950's at what was then the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary. It was a two-year merchandising curriculum that was offered in the Department of Merchandising within the School of Business Administration and later it was located in the Community College Division of Old Dominion College. This program was later incorporated into the curriculum of Distributive Education.

In 1968, Old Dominion College proposed that the Community College Division be dissolved and all existing two-year departments and programs be either absorbed within

an existing four-year curriculum or be abolished.

In September 1968, the Department of Distributive Education was formed and located in the School of Education. In the first few years, there were as many as three hundred students enrolled in the program. Today, the program has become more specialized and the enrollment is much smaller with approximately sixty students enrolled in the program in 1984. A student may either major in education or a training specialist option in the Distributive Education program.

FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

In reviewing the literature that dealt with follow-up studies of graduates, one can find as early as 1950, that there was a need for a systematic and continuous approach for developing effective follow-up studies. In the 1950's, John Powers conducted a research study involving three hundred and forty institutions. He discovered that only about twenty teacher-education programs had procedures for follow-up. The report stated that there were many reasons why universities did not follow-up their graduates. Some of the reasons stated in the report were; (1) lack of financial support for such a program, (2) lack of adequate staff for such a program, (3) geographical spread of teacher placement made it difficult to conduct a follow-up study (4) the value of follow-up did not warrant a shift of faculty to such an assignment (5) need for further evaluation of the present program practices to justify the

expenditures of time, money, and personnel involved in such a procedure.

Today, one would find the same reasons why many universities do not have an on going follow-up procedure currently being followed. Old Dominion University's Distributive Education Program last year stated in their five year plan that they would complete a follow-up study of their graduates within the next five years. The department realized the need for such a study but unfortunately, until this year, did not have the adequate staff to complete such a study.

Today, colleges, universities, and departments are becoming more accountable for the follow-up of their students. The evaluation of a program of study can not be completed without the follow-up of their completors (Bloom, 1963). The most effective evidence of the quality of a program is what happens to the graduates of the program after they receive their instruction in their field of study. The most important person in a university is the student. What happens to the young man or woman while in college, and even after graduation, must be a primary concern to all who are involved in the educational process. The success of the institution can best be measured by the success of the student.

Follow-up studies can be a very useful tool in the recruitment of new students. Follow-up provides future and even current students with reliable information regarding

the success of former students. Graduates who move from the educational setting to the business world to occupy positions of responsibility speak most eloquently for the education and training they received.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented an overview of Distributive Education in Virginia and Old Dominion University. It also briefly discussed the value of follow-up studies. Chapter III will outline the methods and procedures used by this researcher. The findings gathered by the questionnaire will be reviewed in Chapter IV. Finally, Chapter V will summarize this research study and conclusions and recommendations will be offered.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter outlines the methods and procedures employed by this study. They include (1) the instrumentation, (2) the population, (3) the data collection, and (4) the treatment of data. The succeeding sections describe the methods used in this study.

INSTRUMENTATION

Constructing and designing an effective instrument is the priority of this research. Due to the nature of the problem of this study, descriptive research methods are utilized by this researcher. According to Isaac and Michael, the purpose of descriptive research is to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population (Distributive Education graduates) factually and accurately.

Since the purpose of this study is to determine the graduates' employment status, employment positions, and salaries, the follow-up questionnaire is utilized (Appendix A). To compensate for the fact that questionnaires typically have only about a twenty percent return rate, all graduates with known addresses will be included in this study.

The questionnaire consists of two pages. The first page contains eight questions in both open and closed

format. The respondent is asked to sign this page. The second page lists salary levels and the respondent is asked to check the appropriate category. This page remains anonymous to lessen instrument bias.

The questionnaire along with a cover letter (Appendix B) is mailed to the respondents with a postage paid return envelope enclosed for the convenience of the respondents.

POPULATION

The respondents consist of graduates from the Old Dominion University Distributive Education program area located in the School of Education. There are a total of two hundred and two graduates with known addresses from the classes of 1969 through 1984. The names and addresses are obtained from the Distributive Education and Vocational and Technical Education Departments.

DATA COLLECTION

The questionnaire, cover letter, and return postage paid envelope will be mailed to the respondents the third week of March 1985. A follow-up letter (Appendix C) will be mailed the middle of April to the graduates who do not respond to the questionnaire. Included with the follow-up letter, is another questionnaire and a postage-paid envelope.

DATA TREATMENT

Once the data is received, the responses will be tabulated by a calculator and analyzed. Tables and charts will be utilized to illustrate the results of the questionnaire, in accordance with the research goals described in Chapter I.

SUMMARY

The methods and procedures are outlined in Chapter III. From the data collected from the questionnaire, the results will be tabulated and analyzed. The results will be discussed in detail in Chapter IV which is called Findings. Lastly, Chapter V will present the summary, conclusions, and recommendations arising from this study.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The goal of this study was to identify and analyze the employment status of graduates from the Distributive Education department at Old Dominion University. The research objectives established in Chapter I were:

1. To identify the current employment status of the Distributive Education graduates.

2. To determine the number and percentage of graduates in the teaching field.

3. To determine the number and percentage of graduates in the business and retailing fields.

4. To compute the average salaries of the graduates.

5. To determine the employment positions of the graduates.

The research objectives were met through the results of the survey instrument which are compiled and reported in this chapter.

A total population of Distributive Education graduates with known addresses from 1969 through 1984 was used. The survey was mailed to two hundred and two graduates that the researcher could identify as having received their Bachelor of Science Degree from Old Dominion University during the years 1969 through 1984. Eighty-nine responses were received from the initial mailing dated March 22, 1985. The response rate was forty-four percent. On April 12, 1985,

the remaining one hundred thirteen graduates, that had not responded to the initial survey, were sent a follow-up survey. Thirty-eight additional responses were received resulting in a combined response rate of sixty-three percent (one hundred twenty-seven responses from the two hundred and two original follow-up requests). Five responses came from graduates not in the survey population and one letter was returned with addressee unknown. When these six responses are subtracted from the original mailing, one hundred and ninety-six graduates were followed with a final response rate of sixty-five percent (shown in Table 1).

STATUS OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES

Question 1 on the follow-up survey was designed to screen the graduates. From the responses to this question, the researcher was able to determine that three respondents did not graduate with a Bachelor of Science Degree from Old Dominion University. The researcher was also able to determine that two other respondents graduated before the survey group (1969 through 1984).

Due to the fact that some year groups had few responses, the researcher combined the responses of the graduates into three groups. Group 1 were graduates that graduated from 1969 through 1973, Group 2 were graduates that graduated from 1974 through 1978, and Group 3 were graduates from 1979 through 1984. Not all graduates responded to every question in the follow-up survey;

Table 1
Percentage of Graduate Response

| D.E. Graduates | Number | Percentage |
|-------------------|--------|------------|
| Total Nonresponse | 69 | 35% |
| Total Response | 127 | 65% |
| Total Population | 196 | 100% |

therefore, the total responses for each question varied slightly.

Question 2 determined the current educational level of the surveyed graduates. Forty percent of all female graduates from Group 1 had earned a Master's Degree. No females from this group had earned a Doctorate Degree. Fifty-seven percent of the males from this group had earned at least a Master's Degree and six percent had earned a Doctorate Degree. In Group 2, twenty-three percent of the males and thirty-five percent of the females had earned at least a Master's Degree. No graduates from this group had earned a Doctorate Degree. In the last group, the responses showed that no male graduates continued their education to either Master's or Doctorate levels and only three percent of the females had achieved Master's level and none of them had earned a Doctorate Degree. Thirty-eight percent of all the responding graduates have not taken additional course work. Thirty percent of all responding graduates have completed a Master's Degree or higher. Two percent indicated that they have obtained a Doctorate Degree. The total results of Question 2 are shown in Table 2.

Question 3 inquired into the employment status of the graduates. The majority of the graduates were either employed in the field of education or were employed in the fields of business and retailing. Table 3 shows the employment of the graduates, as determined by their responses. Both the number as well as the percentage of the

Table 2

ADDITIONAL COURSE WORK COMPLETED

I - None

V - Master & up to 15 hours

II - up to 15 hours

VI - Masters & more than 15 hours

III - More than 15 hours but
less than a Masters

but less than a Doctorate

VII - Doctorate

IV - Masters Degree

Year Graduated

Hours Completed

| | | | I | | II | | III | | IV | | V | | VI | | VII | |
|----------------|-----|----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|---|-----|----|-----|-----|----|
| Year Graduated | Sex | # | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 1969 - 1973 | M | 32 | 9 | 28% | 4 | 13% | 1 | 3% | 5 | 16% | 4 | 13% | 7 | 22% | 2 | 6% |
| | F | 10 | 2 | 20% | 4 | 40% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 30% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 10% | 0 | 0% |
| | U | 2 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% |
| | T | 44 | 11 | 25% | 8 | 18% | 1 | 2% | 9 | 20% | 4 | 9% | 9 | 20% | 2 | 5% |
| 1974 - 1978 | M | 30 | 17 | 57% | 4 | 13% | 2 | 7% | 3 | 10% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 13% | 0 | 0% |
| | F | 14 | 4 | 29% | 3 | 21% | 2 | 14% | 2 | 14% | 1 | 7% | 2 | 14% | 0 | 0% |
| | T | 44 | 21 | 48% | 7 | 16% | 4 | 9% | 5 | 11% | 1 | 2% | 6 | 14% | 0 | 0% |

Table 2 Con't.

| Year Graduated | | Hours Completed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------------|----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|-----|---|----|
| | | I | | II | | III | | IV | | V | | VI | | VII | | |
| Sex | # | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | |
| 1979 - 1984 | M | 10 | 4 | 40% | 5 | 50% | 1 | 10% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | F | 29 | 12 | 41% | 11 | 38% | 5 | 17% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 3% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | T | 39 | 16 | 41% | 16 | 41% | 6 | 17% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 3% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | M | 72 | 30 | 42% | 13 | 18% | 4 | 6% | 8 | 11% | 4 | 6% | 11 | 15% | 2 | 3% |
| | F | 53 | 18 | 34% | 18 | 34% | 7 | 13% | 5 | 9% | 2 | 4% | 3 | 6% | 0 | 0% |
| | U | 2 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% |
| | T | 127 | 48 | 38% | 31 | 24% | 11 | 9% | 14 | 11% | 6 | 5% | 15 | 12% | 2 | 2% |

M - Male

F - Female

U - Sex Unknown

T - Total

graduates in each employment field are shown. Twenty-three percent of the males were employed in education and the remaining seventy-seven percent of the responding males were employed in business and retailing. No males indicated that they were currently unemployed. Fifty-two percent of the females were professional educators and forty percent were employed in business and retailing. Eight percent of the females responding were unemployed due to full-time home responsibilities. Table 3 shows the total results of Question 3.

Items 4 through 7 of the follow-up survey supplied data for the researcher to accomplish the fifth research objective, which was to determine the employment positions of the graduates. The researcher was able to determine where the respondent was employed as well as the job title. Item 7 was intended to determine the responsibilities of the job. Too often, job titles can be misleading. With duties and responsibilities of the job known, the researcher was able to classify job levels of the respondents. One hundred and twenty graduates were employed as teachers. Five graduates were currently administrators. Ten graduates owned their own businesses. Six graduates indicated that they were either presidents or vice-presidents of companies. Twenty-five responding graduates were in management. Twelve graduates were employed as salesmen and two graduates were attorneys. Finally, twenty graduates indicated that they were employed in other business fields. Results from these

Table 3

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF GRADUATES

| Year Graduated | Type of Employment | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|----|-----------|------|----------|-----|------------|-----|
| | Sex | # | Education | | Business | | Unemployed | |
| | | | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 1968 - 1973 | M | 32 | 10 | 31% | 22 | 69% | 0 | 0% |
| | F | 10 | 3 | 30% | 6 | 60% | 1 | 10% |
| | U | 2 | 2 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | T | 44 | 15 | 34% | 28 | 64% | 1 | 2% |
| 1974 - 1978 | M | 29 | 4 | 14% | 25 | 86% | 0 | 0% |
| | F | 13 | 9 | 69% | 3 | 23% | 1 | 8% |
| | T | 42 | 13 | 31% | 28 | 67% | 1 | 2% |

Table 3 Cont't.

| Year Graduated | Sex | # | Education | | Business | | Unemployed | |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----------|------|----------|-----|------------|----|
| | | | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 1979 - 1984 | M | 9 | 2 | 22% | 7 | 78% | 0 | 0% |
| | F | 29 | 15 | 52% | 12 | 41% | 2 | 7% |
| | T | 38 | 17 | 45% | 19 | 50% | 2 | 5% |
| 1969 - 1984 | M | 70 | 16 | 23% | 54 | 77% | 0 | 0% |
| | F | 52 | 27 | 52% | 21 | 40% | 4 | 8% |
| | U | 2 | 2 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | T | 124 | 45 | 36% | 75 | 60% | 4 | 3% |

M - Male

F - Female

U - Sex Unknown

T - Total

Table 4
GRADUATE EMPLOYMENT POSITIONS

| | | Employment Positions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|----------------------|----|--------|---|-------------------|----|---------------------|---|------|----|-------|----|--------|---|-------|----|-----|
| | | Teacher | | Admin. | | Business Owner | | Pres. & V. Pres. | | Mgt. | | Sales | | Lawyer | | Other | | |
| | Sex # | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | |
| 1969 - 1973 | M | 32 | 6 | 19% | 4 | 13% | 3 | 9% | 4 | 13% | 6 | 19% | 5 | 16% | 2 | 6% | 2 | 6% |
| | F | 9 | 3 | 33% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 11% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 11% | 1 | 11% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 33% |
| | U | 2 | 2 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | T | 43 | 11 | 26% | 4 | 9% | 4 | 9% | 4 | 9% | 7 | 16% | 6 | 14% | 2 | 5% | 5 | 12% |
| 1974 - 1978 | M | 29 | 3 | 10% | 1 | 3% | 4 | 14% | 0 | 0% | 13 | 45% | 4 | 14% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 14% |
| | F | 12 | 9 | 75% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 8% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 8% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 8% |
| | T | 41 | 12 | 29% | 1 | 2% | 4 | 10% | 1 | 2% | 13 | 29% | 5 | 12% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 12% |
| 1979 - 1984 | M | 9 | 2 | 22% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 11% | 1 | 11% | 2 | 22% | 1 | 11% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 22% |
| | F | 27 | 15 | 56% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 4% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 11% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 8 | 30% |
| | T | 36 | 17 | 47% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 6% | 1 | 3% | 5 | 14% | 1 | 3% | 0 | 0% | 10 | 28% |
| 1969 - 1984 | M | 70 | 11 | 16% | 5 | 7% | 8 | 11% | 5 | 7% | 21 | 30% | 10 | 14% | 2 | 3% | 8 | 11% |
| | F | 48 | 27 | 56% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 4% | 1 | 2% | 4 | 8% | 2 | 4% | 0 | 0% | 12 | 25% |
| | U | 2 | 2 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | T | 120 | 40 | 33% | 5 | 4% | 10 | 8% | 6 | 5% | 25 | 21% | 12 | 10% | 2 | 2% | 20 | 17% |

M = Male
F = Female
U = Unknown
T = Total

questions can be found in Table 4.

Question 8 was included in the follow-up survey to determine the interest of the graduates in forming an alumni association. The responses indicated a significant interest in forming an alumni chapter, with seventy-eight graduates indicating support. Table 5 indicates the names of the interested graduates.

The survey's second page was designed to be separated from the first follow-up page. The main purpose for the second page was to determine the current salaries of the graduates. The year graduated, employment field, and sex of the graduates were requested so that the researcher would be able to follow each group. Not all of the graduates responding to the first follow-up page completed this page.

According to the responses of the graduates, the longer the graduates had been out of school the greater the salary the graduates received. Graduates in the field of business received higher salaries than graduates employed in the field of education. Male graduates in both business and education received higher salaries than their female colleagues. In Group 1, seventy-eight percent of all male graduates received salaries of at least \$30,000 and only thirty-three percent of all females received salaries of at least \$30,000. In the second group, fifty-eight percent of the male graduates received salaries of \$30,000 or more and only fifteen percent of the female graduates received salaries of \$30,000 or more. In Group 3, forty percent of

the male graduates earned salaries of \$30,000 or over and none of the female graduates were earning salaries over \$30,000 a year.

The total graduates from all year groups followed indicated the following salaries; one graduate or one percent of the responding graduates indicated that he earned below \$10,000 a year, thirty-three graduates or twenty-nine percent of all responding graduates earned salaries between \$10,000 and \$20,000 a year, thirty-four graduates or twenty-nine percent earned salaries between \$20,000 and \$30,000, twenty-four graduates or twenty percent earned salaries between \$30,000 and \$40,000 and finally, twenty-three or twenty percent of all responding graduates indicated they received salaries of more than \$40,000 a year. The total responses to this question can be found in Table 6.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, the responses to the follow-up survey were reported. The research objectives were again stated and the data was reported in accordance to them. Chapter V will provide a summary, conclusions and recommendations for this study. In the conclusion section, inference will be drawn from the data collected and analyzed in this chapter.

Table 5.

GRADUATES INTERESTED IN
FORMING AN ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Pamala Szynal | 24. Lester Mutchler |
| 2. David Tynch | 25. Melony Walz |
| 3. W. F. Magann, Jr. | 26. Debra Rollins |
| 4. William Miller | 27. David Ankeney |
| 5. Donald Musacchio | 28. Rick Ellenberger |
| 6. Jennings Vamey | 29. Stephen Kerves |
| 7. Glenda Cunnigham | 30. Gary Gumatastao |
| 8. Edward Reed | 31. Karen Painter Carlton |
| 9. Edward Estes III | 32. Ronald Dew |
| 10. Harold Ammons | 33. Jack Hiatt |
| 11. Dan Graves | 34. Eugene Woodward |
| 12. Russell Miller, Jr. | 35. Hal Higginbotham |
| 13. Tim Rovinette | 36. George Gardner |
| 14. Lawrence Fary | 37. Dean Wasson |
| 15. Elizabeth Battista | 38. Richard Grindstaff |
| 16. Kevin McCabe | 39. Fredrick Brown |
| 17. John Apera | 40. Steve Givens |
| 18. Diane Fraser | 41. Doug Rawlins |
| 19. Charles Faison | 42. Lynn Hines |
| 20. Nancy Jones | 43. Diane Brown |
| 21. Marva Berry | 44. Douglas Dayberry |
| 22. Davis Worstine | 45. Stephanie Rayfield |
| 23. Terry Jenkins | 46. Debbie Ellis |

Table 5. (cont.)

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 47. Barbara Stoner | 72. Gregory Robertson |
| 48. Theodore Reynolds | 73. Thomas Lockett |
| 49. Lorraine Hedgepeth | 74. Diane Bakaysa |
| 50. Joy Graves | 75. Luther Atha |
| 51. Kathryn Gill | 76. Walter Soux |
| 52. Elizabeth Miles | 77. Doyle Sampsell |
| 53. Maria Matiatos | 78. Susan Hopkins |
| 54. Mary Curtis | |
| 55. Don Waller | |
| 56. Sandra Sprinkle | |
| 57. Christina Thomas | |
| 58. Ruth Karangelen | |
| 59. Lisa DeFord | |
| 60. Carol Laird | |
| 61. Kenneth Thomas | |
| 62. Barry Culpepper | |
| 63. David Netherton | |
| 64. Diana Wilson | |
| 65. Susan Boatwright | |
| 66. Tom Brennaman | |
| 67. James Baker | |
| 68. Paul Seiden | |
| 69. Suzanne Dezern | |
| 70. Robert Everton | |
| 71. Claude Adkins | |

Table 6

| | | Under \$10,000 | | \$10,000 to \$14,999 | | \$15,000 to \$19,999 | | \$20,000 to \$24,999 | | \$25,000 to \$29,999 | | \$30,000 to \$34,999 | | \$35,000 to \$39,999 | | Over \$40,000 | |
|--------------|------|-------------------|----|----------------------------|----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| Sex | # | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 1969 - 1973 | M 18 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 6% | 1 | 6% | 4 | 22% | 4 | 22% | 8 | 44% |
| (Business) | F 5 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 40% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 20% | 1 | 20% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 20% |
| | M 9 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 11% | 3 | 33% | 2 | 22% | 1 | 11% | 2 | 22% |
| (Education) | F 4 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 25% | 1 | 25% | 1 | 25% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 25% | 0 | 0% |
| | M 27 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 7% | 4 | 15% | 6 | 22% | 5 | 19% | 10 | 37% |
| (Bus. & Ed.) | F 9 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 33% | 1 | 11% | 2 | 22% | 1 | 11% | 1 | 11% | 1 | 11% |
| | T 36 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 8% | 3 | 8% | 6 | 17% | 7 | 19% | 6 | 17% | 11 | 31% |
| 1974 - 1978 | M 24 | 1 | 4% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 17% | 3 | 13% | 2 | 8% | 5 | 21% | 9 | 38% |
| (Business) | F 3 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 33% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 67% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | M 5 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 25% | 1 | 25% | 2 | 50% | 1 | 25% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| (Education) | F 10 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 30% | 7 | 70% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |

Table 6 Con't.

| | | Under to \$10,000 | | \$10,000 to \$14,999 | | \$15,000 to \$19,999 | | \$20,000 to \$24,999 | | \$25,000 to \$29,999 | | \$30,000 to \$34,999 | | \$35,000 to \$39,999 | | Over \$40,000 | |
|--------------|------|-------------------------|----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| Sex | # | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 1974 - 1978 | M 29 | 1 | 3% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 3% | 5 | 17% | 5 | 17% | 3 | 10% | 5 | 17% | 9 | 31% |
| (Bus. & Ed.) | F 13 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 23% | 8 | 62% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 15% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | T 42 | 1 | 2% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 10% | 13 | 31% | 5 | 12% | 5 | 12% | 5 | 12% | 9 | 21% |
| 1979 - 1984 | M 6 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 33% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 17% | 3 | 50% |
| (Business) | F 12 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 25% | 5 | 42% | 3 | 25% | 1 | 8% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | M 4 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 25% | 2 | 50% | 1 | 25% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| (Education) | F 15 | 0 | 0% | 13 | 87% | 2 | 13% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | M 10 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 10% | 2 | 20% | 1 | 10% | 2 | 20% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 10% | 3 | 30% |
| (Bus. & Ed.) | F 27 | 0 | 0% | 16 | 59% | 7 | 26% | 3 | 11% | 1 | 4% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| | T 37 | 0 | 0% | 17 | 46% | 9 | 24% | 4 | 11% | 3 | 8% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 3% | 3 | 8% |
| 1969 - 1984 | M 48 | 1 | 2% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 10% | 6 | 13% | 6 | 13% | 10 | 21% | 20 | 42% |
| (Business) | F 20 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 15% | 7 | 35% | 4 | 20% | 2 | 10% | 3 | 15% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 5% |
| | T 68 | 1 | 1% | 3 | 4% | 7 | 10% | 9 | 13% | 8 | 12% | 9 | 13% | 10 | 15% | 21 | 31% |

Table 6 Con't.

| | Sex # | Under \$10,000 | | \$10,000 to \$14,999 | | \$15,000 to \$19,999 | | \$20,000 to \$24,999 | | \$25,000 to \$29,999 | | \$30,000 to \$34,999 | | \$35,000 to \$39,999 | | Over \$40,000 | |
|--------------|-------|----------------|----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|---------------|-----|
| | | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 1969 - 1984 | M 18 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 6% | 3 | 17% | 3 | 17% | 5 | 28% | 3 | 17% | 1 | 6% | 2 | 11% |
| (Education) | F 29 | 0 | 0% | 13 | 45% | 6 | 21% | 8 | 28% | 1 | 3% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 3% | 0 | 0% |
| | T 47 | 0 | 0% | 14 | 30% | 9 | 19% | 11 | 23% | 6 | 13% | 3 | 6% | 2 | 4% | 2 | 4% |
| | M 66 | 1 | 2% | 1 | 2% | 3 | 5% | 8 | 12% | 11 | 17% | 9 | 14% | 11 | 17% | 22 | 33% |
| (Bus. & Ed.) | F 49 | 0 | 0% | 16 | 33% | 13 | 27% | 12 | 25% | 3 | 6% | 3 | 6% | 1 | 2% | 1 | 2% |
| | T 115 | 1 | 1% | 17 | 15% | 16 | 14% | 20 | 17% | 14 | 12% | 12 | 10% | 12 | 10% | 23 | 20% |

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This was the first formal follow-up study of the graduates from the Distributive Education Department at Old Dominion University. The results of this study will be used by the Old Dominion University's Distributive Education Department in compliance with their five year plan. This chapter attempted to summarize the procedures used in this study, draw conclusions based on the findings previously reported and make recommendations for further research.

SUMMARY

A follow-up of the graduates of the Distributive Education Department at Old Dominion University was conducted. One hundred ninety-six graduates were followed. Responses were ultimately received from one hundred twenty-seven graduates which was sixty-five percent of the follow-up population. The data obtained from the responses to the questionnaire was tabulated to provide information reported in Chapter IV. The tabulated data provided a basis for the conclusions and recommendations of this study.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study which were achieved through the tabulation and analyzation of the responses to the follow-up questionnaire showed that sixty-six percent of the Distributive Education female graduates have taken additional course work compared to fifty-eight percent of the male graduates. A higher percentage of the female graduates were employed in the field of education, which may account for the additional courses completed. (A teacher must possess a valid teaching certificate to teach in the public school systems in the state of Virginia. In addition to a valid teaching certificate, a teacher is required to take an additional six hours every five years to renew their teaching certificate). Thirty-five percent of all male graduates responding to the questionnaire have obtained at least a Master's Degree and three percent have received a Doctorate Degree. Twenty-nine percent of all the male graduates were employed in business management and the business management field is extremely competitive which may account for the higher percentage of male graduates obtaining a Master's Degree. Administrators in education are normally required to have a Master's Degree and out of the sixteen males in education, five of them were administrators. There were no female administrators responding to the questionnaire.

The majority of the male graduates were employed in white collar positions. A very impressive percentage of males graduates owned their own businesses (11%) and four percent of the females graduates owned their own businesses. Forty-six percent of all male graduates, responding the follow-up questionnaire, either owned their own business or were presidents or vice presidents of business establishments, compared to fourteen percent of their female colleagues. The highest percentage of male graduates were employed in business management, which was thirty percent or twenty-one of the responding male graduates. Only eight percent of the responding females indicated that they were employed in business management. The highest percentage of female graduates were employed in the field of education (twenty-seven or fifty-six percent of all female graduates). Only sixteen or twenty-three percent of the male graduates were employed in education, which is probably due to the fact of the low salaries of educators compared to salaries in the business field.

There was a clear difference between the salaries of the males and the salaries of the female graduates. In every field, the males graduates were earning higher salaries than their female counterparts. Sixty percent of all the employed females were earning under \$20,000 a year, compared to nine percent of the male graduates. One of the reasons for this is due to the fact that fifty-five percent of all females came from the third group and eighty-five

percent of all females in group three were earning salaries under \$20,000. Only fourteen percent of all the male graduates were in Group 3 and thirty percent of that group earned under \$20,000 a year.

The Old Dominion University Distributive Education Department should be very proud of their graduates. The overwhelming majority of both the male and the female graduates have professional white collar careers. The results gathered from this survey should be a very useful tool in the recruitment of new students. The results from this survey will also provide future and even current students with reliable information regarding the success of former students from the Distributive Education Department at Old Dominion University.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This was the first formal follow-up study conducted of the graduates from the Distributive Education Department at Old Dominion University. The Advisory Council on Vocational Education, established under the Vocational Act of 1963, found that follow-up studies of students and their progress in the world of work were considered essential (Bloom, Hastings, Madaus, 1971, p. 860). A represented sample of all graduates should be contacted on a regular basis. Graduates of a program should be contacted within a few years after completion of the program of study. After the initial follow-up, graduates are then followed on a regular

basis. It is the recommendation of this researcher to continue follow-up studies on a regular basis. The next follow-up study should be completed in 1990 and should be conducted at five year increments after that.

In this day of accountability, it is mandatory that a program of study receives feedback. The next follow-up study should include some questions concerning course content and career preparation.

Seventy-eight graduates indicated an interest in forming an alumni association. These graduates would be an extremely valuable resource for the Distributive Education Department at Old Dominion University. The graduates that showed an interest in the alumni association were a cross section of businessmen and women and educators. The association would be an excellent source for guest speakers. Finally, the alumni association could be used to evaluate new curriculum as well as to evaluate existing curriculum.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bloom, F., Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971, pp. 6-7.

Evans, Holly B., A Follow-Up of Job-Entry Training Completers At Madison Secondary School 1978-84. Norfolk: Old Dominion University, 1984.

Michael, E. E., Handbook in Research and Evaluation, San Diego, Ca: Edits Publishers, 1971.

Ricks, Billy B., An Analysis of the Usefulness of Educational Research Training to the Vocational Education Students of Old Dominion University, Norfolk: Old Dominion University, 1980.

Tugwell, William H., A Follow-Up Study of Graduates of a City High School, Norfolk, Master's Thesis, Norfolk: Old Dominion University, 1972.

Turney, Billy L. and George P. Robb, Research In Education: An Introduction, Hinsdale, Il: The Dryden Press, 1971.

Van Dalen, Deobold B., Understanding Educational Research, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

APPENDICES

GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In what year did you receive your Bachelor of Science Degree from Old Dominion University? _____

2. Subsequent to receiving your B.S., how much additional course work have you completed at the University level?
 None
 Up to 15 hours
 More than 15 hours but less than a Masters
 Masters
 Masters and up to 15 additional hours
 Masters and more than 15 hours but less than a Doctorate
 Doctorate

3. Check the items that describe your current employment status. (Check as many items as apply.)
 In school
 Not employed
 Full-time home responsibilities
 Active Military Service
 Employed in the field of Education
 Employed in the field of Business/Retailing
 Other (Please specify) _____

If you are employed, please answer all remaining questions.
All other graduates, please skip to question 8.

4. Where are you currently employed? _____

5. What is your job title? _____

6. How long have you been at your present job? _____

7. Briefly describe your job duties and responsibilities.

8. Would you be interested in an organization of O.D.U. Distributive Education Alumni? Yes () No ()

Name _____

The answers to the remaining questions will remain confidential and the information will be used for statistical purposes only.

What is your current income?

- Less than \$10,000
- \$10,000 to \$14,999
- \$15,000 to \$19,999
- \$20,000 to \$24,999
- \$25,000 to \$29,999
- \$30,000 to \$34,999
- \$35,000 to \$39,999
- Over \$40,000

Year graduated with a B.S. Degree _____

Type of employment _____

Male ()

Female ()



Old Dominion University • (804) 440-3000 • Norfolk, VA 23508

March 22, 1985

Dear Distributive Education Graduate,

The Distributive Education Department at Old Dominion University is in its sixteenth year. Since our conception, we are proud to have over two hundred fifty graduates.

Enclosed you will find a follow-up questionnaire. The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information concerning the current employment status and present employment positions of our graduates. We are anxious to hear from each one of you. Your answers are very important to us.

Your responses to the questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential. Your answers will be combined with those of your fellow graduates to provide an overall view of our graduates.

Once you have completed this questionnaire, please return the questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid, self addressed envelope by April 1st. Your time and assistance are greatly appreciated and you are contributing to the success of this important study. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Debra Carroll Rollins'.

Debra Carroll Rollins
Graduate Student

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'John E. Turner'.

Dr. John E. Turner
Chairman, Department of
Voc. and Tech. Education



Old Dominion University • (804) 440-3000 • Norfolk, VA 23508

April 12, 1985

Dear Distributive Education Graduate,

On March 22nd a follow-up questionnaire was mailed to you. The purpose of this questionnaire was to determine the current employment status and present employment positions of our graduates.

The return rate has been very good, however; we have not as yet received your response. Would you please give just a few minutes of your valuable time to complete the questionnaire. Your response is most important and vital to the successful completion of this important study. Enclosed you will find an additional copy of the questionnaire for your convenience. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Debra Carroll Rollins'.

Debra Carroll Rollins
Graduate Student

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'John E. Turner'.

Dr. John E. Turner
Chairman, Department of
Voc. and Tech. Education