

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 015

CE 032 773

AUTHOR Lloyd, Gary Murdock
TITLE An Assessment of Cooperative Vocational Education Programs Since the Education Amendments of 1976.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 235p.
AVAILABLE FROM Utah State Office of Education, 250 East 500 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84111 (\$5.00; quantity price, \$3.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Programs; Coordination; Educational Cooperation; Educational Needs; *Educational Practices; National Surveys; Needs Assessment; Noninstructional Responsibility; *Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; Program Improvement; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Responsibility; Teacher Role; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Vocational Education Amendments 1976

ABSTRACT

A study assessed cooperative vocational education programs since enactment of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. During the study, questionnaires were administered to training sponsors, teacher-coordinators, and students from 80 high schools in Arizona, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia. All vocational program areas were included in the study with a mixture of participants from small, medium, and large high schools. Based on the study findings, the researchers recommended that teacher-coordinators be hired on not less than 10-month contracts and that they devote at least 65 percent of their contract day to coordination responsibilities with the balance of time spent maintaining contact with the classroom setting. They further suggested that the related class be given a time allocation of not less than five hours per week for the expressed purpose of providing the bridge needed by students between vocational classroom training and the world of work. Because of the importance of working with special populations, the researchers also recommended that teacher-coordinators be given inservice training on how to work with handicapped or disadvantaged students in cooperative programs. Finally, they encouraged administrators supervising cooperative programs to develop guidelines to provide opportunities for students who are potential dropouts and in high unemployment areas. (Copies of the three survey questionnaires are appended.) (MN)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED239015

AN ASSESSMENT OF COOPERATIVE
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
SINCE THE EDUCATION
AMENDMENTS OF 1976

BY

Gary Murdock Lloyd

Utah State Office of Education

National Study on

Cooperative Vocational Education

Conducted at The National

Center for Research in Vocational Education

Ohio State University

1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary Murdock Lloyd

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE03 773

ABSTRACT

An Assessment of Cooperative
Vocational Education Programs

Since the Educational
Amendments of 1976

by

Gary Murdock Lloyd

Utah State Office of Education

National Study on
Cooperative Vocational Education

Conducted at The National
Center for Research in Vocational Education
Ohio State University

1981

This study was designed to:

1. Locate "models" of Cooperative Vocational Education across the country at a secondary level.
 2. Evaluate existing programs in all vocational program areas to determine successful components of the Cooperative method of instruction.
 3. Assess the degree of priority given by states to the 1976 Educational Amendments where specific instruction is given. . . to areas that have high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment, as well as high priority to program requirements in the areas of the handicapped and disadvantaged.
 4. Determine the degree to which secondary Cooperative Vocational Education is a viable training method of instruction.
- States selected for the study by a jury of experts were

Arizona, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia. Teacher-Coordinators, Students, and Training Sponsors were contacted directly to complete separate survey instruments.

All vocational program areas such as agriculture and business and office, were included in the study with a mixture of participants from small, medium, and large high schools.

Conclusions

The following components are appropriate for selecting quality Cooperative Vocational Education programs at the secondary level:

1. A qualified teacher-coordinator who is certified in at least one of the vocational program areas as defined by the U. S. Department of Education.

2. A teacher-coordinator who frequently performs the following (assignments are ranked by the greater amount of time coordinators spend in that particular assignment):

- a. Teach related class
- b. Visit training sponsor at least every six weeks
- c. Contact employers about job openings for students
- d. Advise student vocational organization (DECA, FFA)
- e. Evaluate Cooperative Vocational Education students in class as well as on the job
- f. Develop student performance objectives
- g. Conduct follow-up of former students

3. The teacher-coordinator teaches the related class which includes content consisting of the following:

- a. Attitudes
- b. Employer-employee relationships
- c. Communications
- d. Employer-Customer relationships
- e. Information on current technology
- f. Economic information

4. Seventy-five percent or more of the teachers contract time is allocated to the role of teacher-coordinator.

5. The teacher-coordinator is employed ten months or longer to effectively complete the responsibilities that are included in the coordinator position.

6. Teacher-student ratio per hour of release time for coordination is eleven students.

7. Characteristics of a student entering a cooperative program include the following:

- a. The student has an occupational or vocational intent.
- b. The student is in twelfth grade.
- c. The student has received prior vocational program training.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. State departments of education and local education agencies, because of the unique nature of the coordinators duties, should hire teacher-coordinators on not less than ten month contracts.

2. At least 65 percent of the teachers contract day should be devoted to coordination responsibilities with the balance of the contract time allowing the teacher to maintain sufficient contact with

the classroom setting.

3. The related class should be given the time allocation (not less than five hours per week) for the express purpose of providing the bridge needed by students between vocational classroom training and the world of work.

4. Local administrators should provide sufficient time for a quality CVE program to develop in order to reap the benefits of this method of vocational instruction.

5. Vocational Advisory Committees should meet more frequently and with more focus on their responsibilities in order for the effectiveness of the committees to improve.

6. Congress and State legislatures should look carefully at the outcomes produced by this method of instruction and act accordingly with specific funding directed to these programs.

7. Because of the importance of working with Special populations, teacher-coordinators should be given inservice training by the school district or by the State Education Department on how to work with handicapped and disadvantaged students in cooperative programs.

8. Administrators who supervise cooperative programs should be encouraged to develop specific guidelines that will provide opportunities for students who are potential dropouts and areas where high unemployment exists to become participants in a Cooperative Vocational Education Program.

Acknowledgements

A number of persons have assisted in the preparation of this dissertation. Colleagues at the Utah State Office of Education have over the past several years been subjected to my concerns and interest in the topic of this study. Their reactions have given me continuing interest and aided considerably in my intent to move forward in this research effort.

Colleagues at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University (where the study was conducted) have given support and counsel as the study progressed.

In particular I express appreciation to Dr. Jim Watkins, Director of the Advanced Study Center, and Dr. Jim Heffernan, Advanced Study Fellow for their assistance with reference to the structure of the study.

Expression of appreciation is also extended to Harry R. Moon, Vice President M.P.C. Educational Publishers and Dr. Ted Stoddard, Chairman, Department of Business Education and Administrative Management, Brigham Young University, who read and corrected the final draft of the study.

To each of the state departments of education and teachers, students and training sponsors participating in the study, a debt of gratitude is expressed.

Marion Craft, Educational Specialist for the U. S. Department
of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education gave en-
couragement for the study.

Finally I am grateful to Cindy Cheely, Kathy Struve, and Laurie
Bird who spent many hours in typing this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Justification for the Study	7
Definitions of Terms	8
Delimitations to the Study	10
Summary of Chapter	11
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	13
Cooperative Vocational Education	
Legislation	13
Goals of Cooperative Vocational Education	16
Special Populations	17
The Role of Vocational Guidance and Counseling in Cooperative Vocational Education	20
The Role of the Teacher-Coordinator	24
The Role of the Training Sponsor	29
Characteristics of the Student Learner	31
Follow-up of Graduates	34
Cooperative Vocational Education and the Non-Profit Private School	37
Comparative Studies	38

	<u>Page</u>
III. METHODOLOGY	42
Purpose of the Study	42
Selection of Jury	42
Selection of States for Participation	43
Selection of the Sample	44
Development of Instruments for the Collection and Recording of Data	45
Administration of the Survey Instruments	46
Analysis of Results	48
Summary of Chapter	49
IV. FINDINGS AND RESULTS	51
Characteristics of the Teacher- Coordinator Questionnaire	52
Characteristics of the Student Questionnaire	93
Characteristics of the Training Sponsor Questionnaire	107
Summary of Chapter	123
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	130
Summary	130
Conclusions	133
Recommendations	142
BIBLIOGRAPHY	149
Books	149
Articles and Abstracts	149
Yearbooks and Bulletins	150



	<u>Page</u>
Government Documents	151
Unpublished Materials	152
APPENDIXES	154
Appendix A. List of States Which Participated in the Study	155
Appendix B. Letters to Jury	156
Criteria for use in Cooperative Vocational Education Study	160
Appendix C. Letters to State Department Personnel	162
Information and Instruction to Interviewers	165
Information and Instructions to Teacher-Coordinators Participating in Study	167
Appendix D. Teacher-Coordinator Questionnaire	169
Appendix E. Student Questionnaire	190
Appendix F. Training-Sponsor Questionnaire	200
Appendix G. List of National Jury Members	211

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Teacher-coordinator Instrument	
1. Status of participants in National Cooperative Vocational Education study.	52
2. Number of schools, teacher-coordinators, students and training sponsors in the population by strata	53
3. Number of years cooperative program has been operative within department (Question number 1)	54
4. Length of time that teacher has served as a teacher-coordinator (Question number 2)	55
5. Title of the person to whom the teacher-coordinator reports (Question number 3)	56
6. Number of in-service classes attended during past three years (Question number 5)	56
7. How teacher-coordinators perform their coordination responsibilities (Question number 8).	57
8. Analysis of the kinds of activities and number of hours on coordinating each week (Question 9).	58
9. Percent of contract time allocated to role of teacher-coordinator during school year (Question number 11)	60
10. Percentage of students who are taught in the formal classroom setting and coordinated on-the-job by the same teacher-coordinator (Question number 13).	61

Table	Page
11. Length of time that teachers are employed as coordinators by the district (Question 14)	62
12. Number of students coordinated and number of hours released for coordination (Questions 15, 16).	64
13. Use of training agreements and training plans by teacher-coordinators (Questions 19, 20)	65
14. Kinds of assignments performed by teacher-coordinators (Question 21)	66
15. Procedures used to select training stations (Question 22)	67
16. Methods used for career counseling Cooperative Vocational Education students within the department (Question 24)	68
17. Breakout of Cooperative Vocational Education students enrolled in high school vocational education departments during school years 1977-80 (Question 26).	69
18. Teacher-coordinator response to admittance procedures for students entering Cooperative Vocational Education (Question 27).	70
19. Analysis of whether the students receive training in a related class by specific methods of instruction (Question 30)	71
20. Indicate whether or not the following are required as part of the cooperative program (Question 29).	72



Table	Page
21. Indication of how students are received into Cooperative Education Program (Question 28)	73
22. Analysis of content of instruction Cooperative students receive in the related class (Question 31).	74
23. Percent of time that students enrolled in Cooperative program spend in school and at the training station (Question 32)	75
24. Analysis of the number of students participating in Cooperative programs who receive the minimum wage, student learner wage, or no wage (Question 33)	76
25. Influence Cooperative Vocational Education has had on students (Questions 34-35)	77
26. Analysis of the availability of placement services provided within the high school for students who wish to seek full-time employment upon completion of their high school training (Question 36).	78
27. Reasons why students left Cooperative Vocational Education (Question 38).	79
28. Analysis of the follow-up program for students formerly enrolled in the Cooperative Education Program (Question 39).	80
29. Frequency of the follow-up program conducted in the high school programs for graduating students of Cooperative Vocational Education (Question 40).	81

Table	Page
30. Analysis of special provisions at the high school level in Cooperative Vocational Education for special populations (disadvantaged, handicapped, etc.) (Question 41)	82
31. Number of disadvantaged and handicapped students enrolled compared to total Cooperative enrollments in all programs of the population (Question 42)	84
32. Description of facilities used in the department program for Cooperative Education as they relate to current needs of business and industry (Question 44).	85
33. The extent the Vocational Advisory Committee contributed to program improvement (Question 45).	86
34. Frequency of Vocational Advisory Committee meetings current school year (Question 46)	86
35. The extent that unions have assisted the school Cooperative Vocational Education Program (Question 47).	87
36. School has been identified as having a model Cooperative Vocational Education Program. Name some of the most interesting features of program and main reasons for program success (Questions 48, 49)	88
37. Problems needing attention to improve Cooperative Vocational Education program (Question 50).	89
38. Rate Cooperative program on following list of components of program quality (Question 51)	91-92

Table	Student Instrument	Page
1.	Analysis of student sex, marital status, and ethnic origin (Question 5)	94
2.	Analysis of overall grade standing (Question 7)	94
3.	Reasons that students became involved in Cooperative Vocational Education (Question 8)	95
4.	How student first learned about Cooperative Vocational Education Program (Question 9)	96
5.	How often are students supposed to work at training station (Question 11)	97
6.	Amount of pay received by student for work at training station (Question 14)	98
7.	Has the Cooperative Vocational Education Program helped the student to decide on an occupation (Question 15)	99
8.	Relationship of classroom instruction to training station experiences (Question 16)	100
9.	How well does job fit with overall career interests (Question 17)	101
10.	School was more interesting before or after entering Cooperative program (Question 18)	101
11.	Where students learned the most about skills needed for employment (Question 23)	102
12.	Anticipation of finding full-time employment in occupation where now employed (Question 24)	103

Table	Page
13. Student expectations one year from now (Question 25a)	103
14. If in school one year from now will student work also (Question 25b)	104
15. Description of training station position (Question 28)	106

Training Sponsor Instrument

1. Length of time training sponsors and company have been involved with Cooperative Vocational Education (Questions 8 and 9).	108
2. Percentage of Cooperative students represented by minority, ethnic, or racial groups (Question 12).	109
3. Percentage of Cooperative students by sex (Question 13)	110
4a. Are there measurable program objectives developed for your Cooperative Program (Question 14a)	111
4b. Measurable objectives developed by training sponsors (Question 14b)	111
5a. Reasons why training sponsors selected students to work in training stations (Question 15a).	112
5b. Was the selection process satisfactory from training sponsors point of view (Question 15b).	113
6. Evaluation of Cooperative Vocational Education by training sponsors (Question 16)	113
7. Reactions of training sponsors for possible program improvement (Question 17).	114
8. Percentage of students employed who complete the Cooperative Program (Question 20).	115



Table

Page

9. List of various student gains for rating by training sponsor (Question 21)	116
10. Does school or employer have training responsibility for listed functions (Question 22).	117
11. Rating of company's overall relationship with the school (Question 23)	118
12. Number of times training sponsor or representatives have met with school personnel during current year (Question 24).	119
13. Reactions of training sponsors to Cooperative Vocational Education Program (Questions 25-29).	120
14. Training sponsor rating of Cooperative Education Program (Question 30).	122

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the mission of vocational education has been to bridge the gap between vocational program preparation of the student and the student's entrance into the working world. A major goal of cooperative vocational education is to give students who seek career goals an opportunity to use their vocational training directly with part-time employment in a supervised job setting.

Cooperative vocational education as a method of instruction is not new. Congressional support with specific direction and financial assistance is relatively new, however, since the passage of the 1968 vocational education amendments.

The 90th Congress in its passage of the vocational amendments thought highly enough of the results established by participants of CVE that it provided funds for extending the program to additional types of students, particularly those students in areas with high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment.

The rationale for this inclusion in the law was that the guidelines established for students entering CVE would be equally effective for all types of students regardless of background or ability. Disadvantaged and handicapped students were also included for high priority in the development of vocational education training programs under the 1976 amendments.

The cooperative plan for utilizing community training stations has been encouraged for many years in a number of vocational program

areas. This highly effective method of instruction gained the attention of Congress when the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education stated:

"The part-time cooperative plan is undoubtedly the best program we have in vocational education. It consistently yields high placement records, high employment stability, and high job satisfaction."¹

The strong support of secondary school principals was also indicated for the cooperative vocational education method. In this regard they stated:

This study presents strong evidence that cooperative education programs are highly successful; that they appear to be meeting their intended objectives and generating support from students, instructors, administrators, and employers. These programs appear able to serve far larger numbers of students than are presently enrolled....²

The National Association of Secondary School Principals has gone on record as recommending increased funding for cooperative education because of the benefits accrued from this approach.

Some vocational educators have shared a "guarded" optimism toward cooperative vocational education. Tonne and Nanassy in reviewing work experience programs in the area of business education, indicate that some educators who have worked with cooperative vocational programs see no real contribution to the field of education. One reference of note, cited in their work comes from J. Marshall Hanna, Professor Emeritus

¹Ed Nelson, Development of Cooperative Vocational Education Programs under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Public Law 90-576, Resource Manual 71 (Washington, D.C.: Government Services Administration, 1981).

²National Association of Secondary School Principals. Curriculum Report. (Washington, D.C., 1973), p. 9.

of Vocational Technical Education at The Ohio State University.

Unfortunately, cooperative programs established on the secondary school level are little more than work experience programs. They represent true cooperative education on paper but not in actual practice. In all too many cases these programs have been merely a convenient source of part-time help for employers who neither understand nor are fundamentally interested in training youth.

While there are some values in just plain work experience, these values can be overestimated. The advantages must be measured in terms of the price the student pays for their work experience.

That price is acceptance of a restricted educational program in school, limited participation in extracurricular activities, and a decrease in leisure and recreational time.¹

Mary Marks, from the division of Vocational and Technical Education, United States Department of Education, Washington, D.C., while attending a National Seminar on Cooperative Education in 1966 at the National Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, stated the continuing need to maintain the integrity of CVE.

For example, let's not go overboard on cooperative education to the point of weakening other ways of providing vocational education. Let's not label all "work experience" programs for our young people "cooperative education" just because they are school-approved. Some have vocational guidance purposes; others are wage-producing or cultural enrichment programs. The point I want to make is that we must raise no false hopes; we must serve well the great expectations characteristic of cooperative education.²

A number of guidelines have been established for Cooperative Vocational Education. Huffman indicated that the Cooperative Vocational Education method of instruction requires at least the following participants:

¹Herbert A. Tonne, and Louis C. Nanassy, Principles of Business Education (4th ed.; Gregg Publishing Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1970), p. 165.

²Mary V. Marks, "Vocational Integrity in Cooperative Education," Guidelines in Cooperative Education and Selected Materials from the National Seminar Held August 1-5, 1966 (Columbus, Ohio: The National Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1967), p. 186.

1. A teacher-coordinator representing the local education unit, whose major responsibility is to organize the activities of the program around the career interests and goals of the participating students. The teacher-coordinator correlates in-school instruction of the student as well as the learning activities that will take place with the employer at the training station.
2. A student, who after receiving vocational instruction in a particular program area, has the opportunity to apply learned skill at a training station as a participant in the cooperative vocational education program.
3. A training sponsor who is a participant in the cooperative vocational education experience by providing employment and training experiences to the benefit of the student and training stations.¹

In differentiating between Cooperative Vocational Education and Work Experience methods of instruction, Mason and Haines advanced the following, concerning Cooperative Vocational Education:

- * The primary and overriding purpose is to provide occupational competence at a defined entry level. Instruction must be geared to a set of definable performance objectives, providing students with financial assistance, or employment, or even the inducement to stay in school.
- * The instruction both in-school and at the training station are correlated closely with learning experiences. It is this interest which provides the student's motivation for learning.
- * The kind, extent, and sequence of the training station learning experiences are correlated closely with the kind, extent, and sequence of the in-school learning experiences. This correlation is maintained by a coordinator who also teaches or a coordinator with sufficient time to work closely with the instructors of the student.
- * Students may elect the cooperative plan only when they possess the employability characteristics acceptable in the marketplace as well as necessary basic knowledges and skills prerequisite to employment. To use a quotation attributed to

¹Harry Huffman, Coordinator, Guidelines in cooperative education, a Report Resulting from a National Seminar held August 1-5, 1966, at the Center for Research in Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1967), pp. 1-2.



Charles Prosser, the student who enters cooperative instruction "must want it, need it, and be able to profit from it."

- * The employment situation must be truly a training station where the firm understands and accepts its teaching responsibility and where an individual is given time to act as a training sponsor, one who can fulfill the role of the downtown laboratory teacher.
- * The employment conditions are: not only legal employment, but acceptable by all other standards of the school.
- * The coordinator has sufficient time to carry out coordination responsibilities and be accountable for quality education.
- * Instruction is characterized by its individualization, by the use of projects, by remediation as required, and by interaction with the program of a youth organization.¹

An important aspect about the Cooperative Vocational Education program is that each local education unit has a somewhat unique need to operate the cooperative program according to student and employer needs and interests. A Cooperative Vocational Education program, somewhat different from other work experience programs, must become flexible to those needs. Established cooperative vocational education guidelines provide maximum efficiency for those wishing to operate cooperative programs at the highest level.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The objectives of this study were:

1. To determine the degree to which secondary cooperative vocational education is a viable training educational method of instruction.

¹Ralph E. Mason and Peter G. Haines, Cooperative Occupational Education and Work Experience in the Curriculum (Danville, Indiana, The Interstate Printers and Publisher, Inc., 1972) p. 15-17.

2. To assess the degree of priority given by states to the 1976 education amendments where specific instruction is given...to areas that have high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment, as well as high priority to program instruction in the areas of handicapped and disadvantaged.¹
3. To evaluate existing programs in all vocational program areas to determine successful program components of the Cooperative method of instruction.
4. To locate "Models" of CVE programs across the country at the secondary level for those wishing to develop strong CVE programs.

More specific objectives of the study sought to determine:

Teacher-coordinator

1. Characteristics and qualifications--are such things as work experience, previous teaching experience important to success as a teacher-coordinator.
2. Preparation and Certification--do teachers who are certified make stronger teacher-coordinators over teachers who are not certified.
3. Duties and responsibilities--do differences in duties and responsibilities among teacher-coordinators contribute significantly toward their effectiveness.

¹U.S. Congress, Educational Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, 94th Congress, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976) Section 110, 122.

Training Station and Sponsor

1. Characteristics and qualifications--what is the make-up of a highly desirable training sponsor.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE STUDY

In 1963 Congress passed the Vocational Education Act. Part of the provision of the Act provided formula grants for the purpose of assisting each state in strengthening its cooperative vocational education programs. The Educational Amendments of 1968 provided continuation of that funding. In 1976 the Educational Amendments provided optional funding for Cooperative Vocational Education. In essence, the states had opportunity to begin or strengthen existing programs. The congressional approval for funding such cooperative programs was designed to prepare students for employment in a specific occupation or in a similar cluster of like occupations.

Priority for federal funding of these programs under the 1976 Educational Amendments is given to school districts with high rates of school dropouts. Each state is also required to assure that students attending non-profit private schools also have opportunity to participate in Cooperative Vocational Education programs.

In a review of the literature concerning CVE Programs, much of the research suggests that Cooperative Vocational Education is one of the most viable approaches for preparing people for the world of work. One reference in particular states that, "Cooperative Vocational Education works very well in motivating students."¹

¹A paper prepared for presentation to the U.S. Congress by The Secretary of Education, Status of Cooperative Vocational Education in FY 1979, August, 1980.

Recent figures released by the Department of Education however, show a decrease in the number of students who are enrolling in cooperative programs. From 1977 to 1979 there was a 14% decrease in enrollment in Cooperative Vocational Education.

There have been no national evaluation studies conducted on Cooperative Vocational Education since passage of the 1976 Educational Amendments.

As part of the amendment requirements, provisions were included to assure that--

"Priority for funding Cooperative Vocational Education programs through local education agencies is given to areas that have high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment and to the extent consistent with the number of students enrolled in nonprofit-private schools in the area to be served, whose educational needs are of the type which the program or project involved is to meet, provision has been made for the participation of such students."¹

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions will assist the reader in a review of the study:

Cooperative Vocational Education - A program of vocational education for persons who, through written cooperative arrangements between school and employers, receive instruction, including required academic courses and related vocational instruction by alternation of study in school with a job in any occupational field, but these two

¹U.S. Congress, Educational Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, 94th Congress, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976) Section 122 (e) (f).

experiences must be planned and supervised by the school and employers so that each contributes to the student's education and to employability. (P.L. 94-482)

Coordination - Visitations made by a teacher-coordinator to a student's training station for placement, supervision, and evaluation as well as for correlating the job experiences with the related instruction.

Disadvantaged - Persons (other than handicapped persons) who have academic or economic handicaps and who require special services and assistance in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs.

Handicapped - Persons who are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired persons.

Local Education Agency (LEA) - A board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, state, or any other public educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.

Advisory Committee - A group of persons representing employers and employees of business and industry selected for the purpose of offering advice and counsel to the school regarding the occupational program.

Related Cooperative Instruction - In-school course specifically designed to develop and improve attitudes, knowledges, and employability

skills. This course is specifically designed to meet the need of the student who is enrolled in cooperative vocational education, the capstone to the vocational training program.

Teacher-Coordinator - The member of the school faculty who teaches and supervises the students participating in a cooperative education program.

Training Agreement - A document signed by the student, employer, and teacher-coordinator clarifying the responsibilities of each and defining the length, time and hours, and rate of pay for the work experience.

Teaching Plan - A plan determining the specific learning experiences which will be provided on the job and the specific related learning which will be covered in school.

Training Sponsor - The job supervisor who is directly responsible for the training and supervision of the student-trainee.

Training Station - The location of the work and the employer cooperating with the school in the cooperative education program.

Vocational Education - Organized educational programs which are directly related to the preparation of individuals for paid or unpaid employment, or for additional preparation for a career requiring other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree.

DELIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

1. Collection of data was confined to the five states of Arizona, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia offering strong cooperative vocational education programs.

2. Within the five states selected, the number of school districts used were limited to five urban districts, five medium size districts, and five small school districts.

3. The study was limited to secondary vocational education programs offering cooperative vocational education as a method of instruction.

4. There was no attempt to compare cooperative vocational educational programs with other kinds of cooperative programs such as work experience, diversified cooperative, or work study programs.

5. The national study was conducted with limited financial resources thereby limiting the author's ability to include more states and programs in the study.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER

Cooperative Vocational Education is the culminating activity of a student who has taken a number of vocational courses in the 11th and 12th grades of high school in preparation for a career. This activity provides the student with the opportunity to use the vocational training received in an actual employment setting. Under the cooperative method of instruction, a wide range of activities and responsibilities is provided for the student in school and on the job. Systematic evaluation of training stations and in-class activities becomes essential in high quality programs in the cooperative area. The student works approximately sixteen hours per week, and is paid the minimum wage. The student is supervised by a teacher-coordinator who

assists him or her to bridge the gap between the world of work and vocational training received at the high school more easily.

The training sponsor under agreement provides supervised work experience for the cooperating student during the time of enrollment in the cooperative vocational education program.

The purpose of this study was to determine the location of highly successful programs in Cooperative Vocational Education at the secondary level and to evaluate existing successful models in all vocational program areas to determine successful program components of the cooperative methods of instruction.

Finally, the study sought to assess the degree of priority given by states to the 1976 educational amendments where specific priority is given to areas that have high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment.

This National Study was conducted in cooperation with the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

During the past 10 years, there has been a sufficient variety of nonresearch literature available in regard to both the general and specific aspects of Cooperative Vocational Education. The studies that have a research base in overall evaluation of Cooperative Vocational Education, however, are limited. Four studies have been conducted on a national level during the past 10 years. During the past 15 years, there have been several studies conducted at the state level in the area of CVE. A number of related studies have been reviewed.

The review of literature which follows, contains a synopsis of the studies and research completed in the area. The studies included here are classified into nine areas: Goals and Elements of CVE, Special Populations, The Role of Vocational Guidance and Counseling in CVE, The Role of the Teacher Coordinator, The Training Sponsor, Characteristics of the Student Learner, Follow-up of Graduating Students, Comparative Studies on CVE, and Chapter Summary.

COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Cooperative Vocational Education is defined in the 1976 educational amendments as:

...a program of vocational education for persons who, through cooperative arrangements between the school and employers, receive instruction, including required academic courses and related vocational instruction by alternation of study in school with a job in any occupational field, but these two experiences must be

planned and supervised by the school and employers so that each contributes to the student's education and to his or her employability. Work periods and school attendance may be on alternate half days, full days, weeks or other periods of time in fulfilling the cooperative program.¹

With the passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 under provisions indicated in Part G, Cooperative Vocational Education received the first significant support from Congress. Specific regulations were given the states for inclusion in their state plans. In part, the provisions indicated:

In order to prepare young people for employment through (a) providing meaningful work experiences combined with formal education enabling students to acquire knowledge, skills, and appropriate attitudes, (b) removing the artificial barriers which separate work and education, and (c) involving educators with employers, creating interaction whereby the needs and problems of both are made known, thereby making it possible for occupational curricula to be revised to reflect current needs to various occupations, funds allotted to the states for the purpose of Part G of the Act may be used for the expansion of Cooperative Vocational Education programs, and for ancillary services and activities which are necessary to assure quality in such programs.²

In addition, the act indicated that state boards for vocational education were instructed to include provisions in their state plans providing for the establishment of Cooperative Vocational Education programs within local education agencies. Public and private employers also were encouraged to participate in the cooperative program. Added

¹U.S. Congress, Educational Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, 94th Congress, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976) Section 195.

²Ed Nelson, Development of Cooperative Vocational Education Programs under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Public Law 90-576, Resource Manual 71 (Washington, D.C.: Government Services Administration, 1971).

emphasis was given in the act for the establishment of cooperative vocational education programs in new and emerging job fields.

On February 26, 1969, Roman C. Pucinski, then congressman from the State of Illinois, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Education spoke to the National Conference on Cooperative Vocational Education, held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and indicated that under 1968 Educational Amendments, Part G, that federal funds might be used for four purposes:

1. Training and support of coordinators.
The success of cooperative programs rests on the ability of coordinators to serve as catalysts of change both within the school and between the school and the community. They must furnish students with attractive jobs and relevant curricula, cultivate businesspersons' interest in the school and in vocational education, and bring the school and the community together in the education of young people.
2. Instruction related to work experience.
The limited funds authorized were intended for vocational instruction directly related to job experience.
3. Reimbursement to employers for certain added costs.
The intent was that employers should pay students a full wage and provide them with jobs where they can advance, but should be reimbursed for costs over and above the costs of training ordinary employers.
4. Payments to students for certain costs.
The intent was to overcome minor economic obstacles which prevent students from participating--tools, carfare, books uniforms, etc.¹

Additional provisions in the 1976 amendments developed by Congress called for cooperative vocational education to address two areas where little attention had been drawn in the past.

¹Roman C. Pucinski, Congressional Expectations of Cooperative Vocational Education, A presentation at the National Conference on Cooperative Vocational Education held February 26, 1969, at the University of Minnesota, (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1969) pp. 41-42.

...Priority for funding cooperative vocational education programs through local educational agencies is given to areas that have high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment; ...To the extent consistent with the number of students enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served, whose educational needs are of the type which the program or project involved is to meet, provision has been made for the participation of such students.¹

GOALS OF COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Borow in his scholarly paper addressing the National Conference on Cooperative Education focused the following thoughts on Cooperative Vocational Education:

"Broadly speaking, three goals of vocational education are pursued in the work experience aspect of cooperative education programs. First, the student learns the characteristic skills, duties, and practical understandings associated with the occupation to which he is assigned through a training station. These are cognitive learning. Secondly, he acquires what we may call a work ethos, a set of attitudes, rules of etiquette, and interpersonal skills involving relations with fellow workers, supervisors, and clients. In short, he learns how society, and especially his place of work, expects him to "play the game." It is astonishing to what degree the school and the community assume that any student who is making the transition from school to employment has somehow mastered work protocol and the repertoire of unwritten and informal, yet highly critical, situational skills. It may be noted, parenthetically, that among culturally disadvantaged youth it is the utter lack of an acceptable work ethos quite as fully as inadequate training in the formal duties of the job that makes the work situation seem so bewildering and terrifying and which so frequently predisposes such novices to almost certain failure. Thirdly, the school youth enrolled in a cooperative education program may come to know better what manner of person he is--what strengths, limitations, aspirations, and personal values characterize him. These personal attributes are, as a matter of fact, frequently shaped and fortified by the work

¹U.S. Congress, Educational Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, 94th Congress, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976) Section 122.

experience itself. If the student is the fortunate beneficiary of wise and sensitive supervision, he will learn to see himself psychologically mirrored in the work situation.¹

Mason and Haines concluded after conducting two studies in the State of Michigan that there are general goals that form a part of all cooperative vocational education. Their list includes:

- * Career Orientation
- * Work Exploration
- * Economic Awareness
- * Skill Development
- * Skill Application
- * Upgrading Skills
- * Job Placement²

SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Included in the term special populations are those individuals who are termed "disadvantaged" or "handicapped." Public Law 94-482 passed by Congress in 1976 specified certain services and programs relating to the handicapped and disadvantaged student that were to be implemented. The law further defined the handicapped and disadvantaged student.

...The term "handicapped," when applied to persons, means persons who are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired persons who by reason thereof require special education and related services, and who, because of their handicapping condition, cannot succeed in the regular vocational education without special education assistance or who require a modified vocational education program.

¹Henry Borow, "Potential Contributions of Cooperative Education to the Student's Vocational Development", (paper presented at the National Conference on Cooperative Vocational Education, Minneapolis, Minnesota, February, 1969).

²Ralph E. Mason and Peter G. Haines, Cooperative Occupational Education and Work Experience in the Curriculum, (Danville, The Interstate Printers & Publishers, 1972), p. 11.

...The term "disadvantaged," means persons (other than handicapped persons) who have academic or economic handicaps and who require special services and assistance in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs, under criteria developed by the commissioner based on objective standards and the most recent available data.¹

Because the law (94-482) lacked clarification on the issue as to whether the handicapped and disadvantaged student should be separated from the "mainstream" student, the then U.S. Commissioner of Education, Ernest L. Boyer, in 1978 filed the following clarification:

The removal of the handicapped or disadvantaged students from the regular education may occur only when the nature of severity of the handicapped or disadvantaged is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. In order to achieve this end, handicapped and disadvantaged students should be placed, if possible, in a mainstreamed program.²

Richardson in her study indicated that:

Providing disadvantaged youth with education that will prepare them for productive employment and guarantee them the satisfactions of full life is a crucial and difficult task.³

A study by Lee in identifying the number of high school cooperative education programs that served low-average ability students in the State of Illinois found that the needs of very few low-average ability students were served by Cooperative Office Education programs. Results

¹U.S. Congress, Educational Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, 94th Congress, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976) Section 202.

²U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, RESURGE, '79, (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979), pp. 44-45.

³Ruth Richardson, An Evaluation of Part-G Cooperative Vocational Education Programs in Selected High Schools in the State of Tennessee--1973-1974. The University of Tennessee, 1974.

of the teacher-coordinator interviews in Lee's study indicated that low-average ability students benefited from participating in cooperative education programs as a result of their experience in cooperative education. Lee's study determined the major problems of working with low-average ability students were (1) the difficulty of securing training stations for the student, (2) developing appropriate personal qualities and (3) the lack of adequate materials in the classroom for those involved in cooperative education with special needs.¹

A National study by Walsh on urban Cooperative Education Programs indicated that since 1968, there has been a substantial number of disadvantaged and below average Cooperative Vocational Education programs.

Walsh credits this increase to the 1968 educational amendments.

Walsh further indicated that a substantial number of programs have been designed specifically for students of below average to average academic standing, and for disadvantaged students.²

Goldston sought to examine the perceptions of students, teachers, parents, and employers toward special Cooperative Vocational Education for disadvantaged students. She found in her survey that students, teachers, parents, and employers alike agreed on the importance of a cooperative program in which students could participate:

"The participants of the study perceived the program to be important as a direct means of helping students improve their punctuality, school attendance and academic achievement....."

¹Charlotte A. Lee, "A Study of Cooperative Office Education Programs in the State of Illinois to Determine the Nature and Extent to Which Such Programs Serve the Needs of Low-Average Ability Students." (unpublished Master's Thesis, Northern Illinois University, 1966).

²John Walsh and V.J. Bregilo, Urban Cooperative Education Programs and Follow-up Study. Executive Summary. (San Francisco: Olympus Research Centers, 1976) p. 31.

As further perceived by the respondents, areas of weaknesses of the special cooperative program model included areas for the provision of in-service education to both teachers and employers.¹

THE ROLE OF VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING
IN COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The relationship of the school guidance counselor to the teacher-coordinator in any of the vocational education programs becomes a critical factor to the success of a Cooperative Vocational Education program. In describing some of the numerous responsibilities of the Vocational Guidance Counselor in relation to CVE, the 1976 Educational Amendments indicate that grant money going to the states will be used in part:

...to support programs for vocational development guidance and counseling programs and services which...shall include

- (1) initiation, implementation, and improvement of high quality, vocational guidance and counseling programs and activities;
- (2) vocational counseling for children, youth, and adults leading to a greater understanding of educational and vocational options;
- (3) provision of educational and job placement....²

Campbell's study on the role of secondary schools in the preparation of youth for employment indicated that school guidance counselors have a great variety of assignments given them by administrators and just 40% of their time is spent in guidance counseling. Campbell

¹Maude Perkins Goldston, "An Evaluation of the Special Cooperative Vocational Education for Disadvantaged Students in Virginia," (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1978).

²U.S. Congress, Educational Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, 94th Congress, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976) Section 134.

further states that without appropriate goals being set by administrators there is little chance in the future that the guidance counselor can assume the role of giving more than lip service to the needs of students who wish to enroll or who are enrolled in vocational education programs.¹

Kaufman's study drew similar results to the Campbell study by indicating that:

Apparent weaknesses in the aims and objectives of guidance programs were:

- a. Lack of provision for disseminating labor market information.
- b. Lack of provision for concerted effort to assist youth to achieve desirable goals.
- c. Failure to provide for adequate dissemination of occupational information.

Kaufman further noted:

In regard to counseling staff, the major weakness noted was the general lack of occupational experience outside their (counselor's) field.

It was consistently found that most of the guidance people were college-oriented and that they depended on the student to take the initiative in seeking information in order to make a vocational choice.²

¹Robert E. Campbell, Vocational Guidance in Secondary Education, a publication of the National Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1968), pp. 99-100.

²Jacob Kaufman, The Role of the Secondary Schools in the Preparation of Youth for Employment, Institute for Research on Human Resources, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, February, 1967.

Cohen and Frankel concluded a national study in 1973 on School Supervised Work Education Programs and one of their findings concluded that:

The counseling components of all types of programs were relatively ineffective and did not contribute significantly in any manner to student success. This study also found that careful matching of students to jobs, results in satisfied employers and students..... In the dropout prevention programs in particular, it is fairly common to find students working in jobs in which they have little interest and for which they are overqualified from a cognitive standpoint.

Relating to the need for students who are preparing for part-time employment as part of their vocational training Cohen and Frankel indicated that

"To increase the effectiveness of counseling components, it should be required that students be given vocational interest and aptitude tests before entering any work education program, and have a chance to discuss their test results with a qualified person before being assigned to their first work station.¹

In an attempt to further define the role of the guidance and placement service and to coordinate the cooperative vocational education method with that role, Wallace indicated that the future pattern for counselors will be the identification rather than the selection of the students.²

¹Allan J. Cohen and Steven M. Frankel, Executive Summary, An assessment of school-supervised work education programs. (System Development Cooperation: Santa Monica, California, 1973) p. 19.

²Harold R. Wallace. Review and Synthesis of Research on Co-operative Vocational Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1970)

Billings concluded that students were more enthusiastic toward Cooperative Vocational Education programs than other forms of work experience because they had already selected a career in which they could channel their interests. Cooperative Vocational Education provided the avenue in which they could apply these skills.

He further states:

The student's initial exposure to occupations should be to all the broad fields, and, later, exploration in depth of careers which are of interest. The cooperative training will be more beneficial when the student is able to participate in planning the training he needs to achieve his goals.¹

Butler and York noted:

Although the primary responsibility of enrollment, placement, and follow-up usually rests with the teacher-coordinator, there should be open lines of communication with all of these potential sources of assistance in order to optimize the opportunities and career development of students. Of particular importance is the teacher-coordinator's relationship with the guidance counselor.²

In support of the importance of good relationships between counselors and teacher-coordinator, Huffman's study indicated certain services that should be included:

Effective Counseling. The guidance counselor and the teacher-coordinator should help each student to recognize his or her special interests and aptitudes through an interpretation of school records, test profiles, home background, and other information that may be available.

Selection of Students. The teacher-coordinator should work closely with the guidance counselor in the selection of students

¹Billings, Donn. "Cooperative Occupational Education Programs: A Conference Seminar to Extend the Range of Vocational Education", New York, New York: The City University of New York, 1970.

²Roy L. Butler and Edwin G. York, What State Leaders Should Know about Cooperative Vocational Education, a publication of the National Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1971).

who meet certain requirements agreed upon by the school and the employers. Consideration for selection criteria should logically include the student's age, willingness, ability, and readiness for the program.

Enrollment Procedure. The enrollment procedure should be well defined and understood by all concerned. School personnel and the employer-sponsor should know the factors which determine student selection and placement in training stations.

Parental Approval and Support. The teacher-coordinator should confer with parents about the factors relating to vocational choice and career planning.

Periodic Counseling. The teacher-coordinator should counsel periodically with the students concerning (a) career objectives, (b) achievement in relation to aptitude and ability, (c) personal and social adjustment, and (d) job performance record.

Job Placement. The teacher-coordinator should maintain a current file on job opportunities available to graduates and help them obtain employment.

Follow-up. The teacher-coordinator should maintain a follow-up file of the graduates from the Cooperative Vocational Education Program.¹

ROLE OF THE TEACHER-COORDINATOR

The teacher-coordinator has been identified as a "director of learning."

In identifying the critical incidents to determine which requirements were critical for the performance of secondary school distributive education teacher-coordinators, Sampson summarized his findings by stating:

1. The teacher-coordinator is adept at conducting the classroom and functions effectively with groups within the school and community.

¹ Harry Huffman, "Guidelines for Cooperative Education and Selected Materials" from the National Seminar held August 1-5, 1966, A Manual for the Further Development of Cooperative Education. (Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1967.) 245 pp. (ED 011 044)

who meet certain requirements agreed upon by the school and the employers. Consideration for selection criteria should logically include the student's age, willingness, ability, and readiness for the program.

Enrollment Procedure. The enrollment procedure should be well defined and understood by all concerned. School personnel and the employer-sponsor should know the factors which determine student selection and placement in training stations.

Parental Approval and Support. The teacher-coordinator should confer with parents about the factors relating to vocational choice and career planning.

Periodic Counseling. The teacher-coordinator should counsel periodically with the students concerning (a) career objectives, (b) achievement in relation to aptitude and ability, (c) personal and social adjustment, and (d) job performance record.

Job Placement: The teacher-coordinator should maintain a current file on job opportunities available to graduates and help them obtain employment.

Follow-up. The teacher-coordinator should maintain a follow-up file of the graduates from the Cooperative Vocational Education Program.¹

ROLE OF THE TEACHER-COORDINATOR

The teacher-coordinator has been identified as a "director of learning."

In identifying the critical incidents to determine which requirements were critical for the performance of secondary school distributive education teacher-coordinators, Sampson summarized his findings by stating:

1. The teacher-coordinator is adept at conducting the classroom and functions effectively with groups within the school and community.

¹ Harry Huffman, "Guidelines for Cooperative Education and Selected Materials" from the National Seminar held August 1-5, 1966, A Manual for the Further Development of Cooperative Education. (Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1967.) 245 pp. (ED 011 044)

2. The teacher-coordinator understands current policy, makes it known to appropriate people, and communicates information and ideas effectively.

3. The teacher-coordinator shows respect for students and is highly committed to their individual growth, both in personal development and in occupational understanding.

4. The teacher-coordinator is firm, logical, and consistent in behavior.

5. The teacher-coordinator is well organized and concentrates teaching effort on the subject matter under study.

6. The teacher-coordinator uses a variety of techniques in teaching and operating the distributive education program.¹

Harris conducted a study of office education teacher-coordinators and sought to identify (1) the effective and ineffective critical requirements for office education teacher-coordinators; (2) the interaction of effective and ineffective behaviors with office education teacher-coordinators, programs, and community characteristics; and (3) the reasoned judgment reactions of office education teacher-coordinators concerning selected issues relative to the operation of the secondary school cooperative program. He concluded:

1. The critical requirements for effective and ineffective job performance of secondary school office education teacher-coordinators can be determined by analyzing appropriate data supplied by competent observers.

2. Experienced office education teacher-coordinators were able to provide critical-incident reports that were more comprehensive and insightful than those supplied by supervising school administrators.

¹Harland E. Samson, "Critical Requirements for Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators," (a summary of a Ph.D. Dissertation completed at the University of Minnesota, 1964), The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, VIII (August, 1966), 1-2.

3. The behavioral data reported by each of the observer groups, the experienced office education coordinators and their supervising school administrators in Illinois, provided a basis for understanding the effective and ineffective behaviors of teacher-coordinators.

4. Supervising school administrators are as aware of the personal and professional relationships of the office education coordinators as they are of the selection of training stations and placement activities of the coordinators.

5. Office education teacher-coordinators are considerably more concerned with adjusting student training-station performance problems than with any other phase of their activity.

6. Office education teacher-coordinators are more successful in adjusting student problems than in any other phase of their job activity.

7. Student discipline and control is a job activity area of concern to office education teacher-coordinators. The highest percentage of coordinators reporting ineffective behaviors were in the area of discipline and control.

8. Most of the student performance problems dealt with by office education coordinators are concerned with errors and other misjudgements.

9. The critical requirements for the effective and ineffective performance of secondary school office education teacher-coordinators are related to a large extent to adjusting student training-station performance problems, to a lesser extent to selection of training stations and placement activities, personal and professional relationships, adjusting student problems, and development and promotion of the program.

10. The behavior patterns of individual office education teacher-coordinators were not significantly different from one another....

11. The critical requirements provide a basis for insight into the job activities of office education teacher-coordinators which can be used to design the preservice and inservice education programs for teacher-coordinators.¹

¹E. Edward Harris, "Office Education and Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators: Critical Requirements and Reasoned-Judgment Comparisons" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1965), pp. 369-371.

The Walsh study conducted for the United States Office of Education identified the following responsibilities of the typical teacher-coordinator:

1. In-school promotion and recruitment.
2. Selection of students
3. Preparation of curricula
4. Teaching of cooperative classes
5. Job development and employee relations
6. Referrals of students to jobs
7. Inspecting work sites and observation
8. Counseling of students
9. Grading of students
10. Placement
11. Self evaluation¹

The Mitchell study found in business education that the following tasks were critical to the success of the cooperative office education teacher:

- * 15% clerical and program management tasks
- * 14% youth leadership activities
- * 14% out-of-class coordination activities
- * 9% teaching lessons
- * 9% selecting and placing students

¹ John Walsh and Vincent J. Breglio, An Assessment of School Supervised Work Education Programs Part II, Urban Cooperative Education Programs and Follow-up Study, Executive Summary, (San Francisco: Olympus Research Centers, 1976), pp. 12-13.

- * 8% testing and evaluating students
- * 8% planning and developing lessons
- * 7% guidance and counseling
- * 6% program publicity
- * 5% administrative duty assignment, and
- * 5% professional development¹

In a study prepared for the U.S. Office of Education by Cotrell, it was determined that certain pedagogical performance requirements were common to all program areas for teacher-coordinators at the secondary level. Cotrell drew the following conclusions:

1. Performance requirements tended to be the same for teacher-coordinators from the six secondary cooperative vocational education programs represented in the study.
2. No support was found in this study for projecting specialized professional education curricular offerings for each of the cooperative vocational programs represented.
3. A performance base was generated for the development of teacher education curricular offerings, certification requirements, and evaluation systems for teacher educators and secondary level teacher-coordinators in Cooperative Vocational Education programs (see Appendix for a summary of Cotrell's ratings).²

Inservice education for teacher-coordinators was addressed by Roth. He sought to provide state and local professional development personnel with planning data pertinent to in-service needs for teacher-

¹Michael K. Mitchell, "Tasks Performed by Vocational Cooperative Teachers in Secondary Schools of Texas Considering Time Spent, Importance, Use of Teacher Aides, and Implications for Curriculum Development." (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1978)

²Calvin J. Cotrell and others, Model Curricula for Vocational and Technical Teacher Education: Report No. III, Performance Requirements for Teacher-Coordinators. Final Report. (Columbus: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, 1972), p.22.

coordinators of Cooperative Vocational Education programs in the State of Illinois.

In interviews with 294 teacher-coordinators Roth found that the top four in-service education needs expressed by the teachers were to:

1. Correlate classroom instruction with on-the-job training
2. Student placement
3. Student adjustment to the work environment
4. Improvement on the job learning environment.¹

THE TRAINING SPONSOR

In a determination of what employers are seeking when hiring new employees Lee found that:

Key words that employers often use in describing workers include "initiative," "attitude," "loyalty," "enthusiasm," "dependability," "ability to listen and carry out instruction," "cheerfulness," "reliability," and a "willingness to learn." Youths who do not have the positive traits associated with these terms will often have difficulty in successful work entry.²

Clarens stated:

Employers seldom express dissatisfaction with occupational skills beginning workers bring to their jobs, but they are forever reminding vocational teachers they must turn out beginning workers who have "good" attitudes and the motivation to work... The vocational educator may be very confident in teaching the skills of the occupation or the "how to's" in his vocational field.

¹Gene Leon Roth, "In-service Education Preferences of Illinois Cooperative Vocational Education Teacher-coordinators", (Carbondale, Southern Illinois University, 1978).

²J. S. Lee, Youth: Work Entries through Vocational Education, (Yearbook #6, American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C., 1976) p. 189.

but have great difficulty in developing the kinds of attitudes and values employers expect when young workers begin their first jobs.¹

Eight hundred ninety-seven employers participated in the Battelle Study to determine the cost-effectiveness of cooperative vocational programs. Their results show a definitely favorable attitude on the part of the employers toward the graduates of cooperative programs. The responses favoring cooperative graduates was 58.6 percent versus 4.2 percent for non-cooperative graduates, with 36.6 percent indicating no significant difference. Results of the employer survey six months after employment for the cooperative graduate versus the non-cooperative graduate showed that 60.5 percent of the employers favored the cooperative while 2.8 percent favored the non-cooperative graduate with 35.6 percent showing no difference.²

Hayes and Travis in analyzing employers' perceptions of the costs and benefits of the cooperative program found from interviews of 70 private sector employers that:

77% of the 60 respondent employers termed their experience in recruiting new cooperative education students as either "excellent" or "good-very good."³

¹M. K. Claunes, Developing Values and Attitudes in Vocational Education, (Washington, D.C., Yearbook #2, American Vocational Association, 1972), p. 130.

²Daniel E. Molnar, Cost Effectiveness of Selected Cooperative Vocational Education Programs as Compared with Vocational Programs without a Cooperative Component, (Columbus, Battelle Laboratories, 1973) pp. 97-103.

³Richard A. Hayes and Jill H. Travis, "Employer Experience with the Recruitment of Cooperative Education Employees, An Analysis of Costs and Benefits", The Journal of Cooperative Education, Vol. XIII, No. 1, November, 1976.

Eisen in his study of office workers found in response to his questionnaire to 140 responding businesspersons that:

97.1 percent believed the cooperative office work experience program was a valuable one in preparing students for careers in an office. There were 94.2 percent of the businesspersons who said they were happy to have a part in attracting and helping to train young people for careers in offices....As reported by 47.4 percent of the businesspersons, cooperative office work experience students advanced faster than others of the same age. Almost 40 percent of the businesspersons stated that cooperative students were more mature than other high school students.¹

One significant finding in Cohen's study concerning the employers' point of view relating to Cooperative Vocational Education was that the purpose of the cooperative program had very little impact on their attitude toward the program, due in part, perhaps to the employer having never received orientation regarding the different purposes of various work education program configurations.²

Cohen also found in his study that:

Employers feel that they are getting their money's worth out of their student workers and are contributing to their occupation.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT LEARNER

Wallace indicates that in the majority of studies produced in the sixties, two things became obvious:

1. The Great Majority of studies are concerned with how the student feels about something--his values, aspirations, perceptions, concerns, etc.

¹ Norman Eisen, "Work Experience in California" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966).

² Alan J. Cohen and Steven M. Frankel, An Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs, (Santa Monica, System Development Corporation, 1973)

2. It is obvious that much of the research is generated and conducted in comparative isolation, without reference to a larger theoretical framework.¹

Several studies relating to the student's "self concept" as it applies to Vocational Education are worthy of note here. Warmhoff conducted a study which is an extension of Brookover's relating to the basic concepts of a theory of occupational choice.

In reviewing Warmhoff's study, Wallace indicates

"A basic premise in the Warmhoff study is that the self concept of vocational ability is not a remote psychological construct. It is, in effect, whatever the students might feel about themselves and it is assumed that the student is fully aware of and able to accurately report what his or her self concept is.

....Some of the findings reported by Warmhoff led him to conclude that there was a "substantial relationship" between the students' self concepts and their perceptions of how others would evaluate their potential for success in high status occupations".²

A number of studies have concentrated on the area of work adjustment. Golden said the: "vocational satisfaction is a function of the correspondence between the reinforcers in the work environment and the individual's vocational needs."³ Golden confirmed a premise that if workers find personal satisfaction in their employment, they will enjoy their work.

¹Harold R: Wallace, Review and Synthesis of Research on Cooperative Vocational Education (Columbus: The National Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, 1970), pp. 13-14.

²Ibid, pp. 15, 16.

³Robert Golden and David J. Weiss, Relationship of Vocational Satisfaction to the Correspondence of Job-Reinforcement and Vocational Needs. Work adjustment project (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 1968).

Klaurens sought to determine what factors in the work experiences of students were associated with job satisfaction. As a result of her study, Klaurens recommended the following:

1. Criteria for selection of training stations should include evaluation of potential satisfactions in training positions.

2. Planned experiences on the job should provide opportunities for student trainees to experience psychological growth through work activities that challenge their abilities.

3. Student trainees should receive their initial training experience in positions where supervisors and co-workers are suitable role models and are individuals with whom the student trainees can interact.

4. Student trainees should enter the initial job with basic skills and some specialized competencies which will prevent them from experiencing failure and equip them to experience achievement, recognition, and responsibility in their training.

5. Student trainees should have learning experiences which help them to be tolerant of the needs, values, and personal characteristics of co-workers, supervisors, and customers.¹

Cohen and Frankel sought to find the answer to two questions concerning Cooperative Vocational Education relating to job satisfaction. Students were asked a series of 34 questions about the characteristics of their job and their attitude toward it.

Sixteen of these items relating directly to the student's satisfaction with his job were combined into a single job satisfaction score. The following are three examples of the specific items used: "Would you do this job as a volunteer?"; "Do you often wish you didn't have to go to work?"; and "Does your boss tell you when you do a good job?". The score was derived by computing the percentage of a student's total responses

¹Mary K. Klaurens, "The Underlying Sources of Job Satisfaction of Distributive Education Student-Trainees" (Doctoral dissertation, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 1967).

that indicated satisfaction with his job. Thus the score could range from 0 to 100, and the mean scores for total sample of participating students was 66.7.¹

Cohen and Frankel also asked students who were enrolled in cooperative programs whether or not they felt that they could recommend to a friend that they enter the cooperative program. Ninety-four percent of the students responded that they would recommend the cooperative program.

Walsh's study comparing 168 students enrolled in cooperative programs versus 451 students who were working but not enrolled in cooperative programs found that students enrolled in cooperative education programs rated higher in the areas of job satisfaction, job responsibility, school satisfaction, and a likelihood of recommending cooperative programs to friends. Cohen and Frankel also found that nonparticipants of cooperative programs rated the overall quality of their jobs higher than participants of cooperative programs and that the non-participants rated training and supervision on the job equal to participants.²

FOLLOW-UP OF GRADUATES

A number of comparative follow-up studies have been conducted on a local or state basis to determine the effectiveness of Cooperative

¹ Alan J. Cohen and Steven M. Frankel, An Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs, (Santa Monica, System Development Cooperation, 1973), p. II-4.

² John Walsh and Vincent J. Breglio, An Assessment of School Supervised Work Education Programs, Part II: Urban Cooperative Education Programs and Follow-up Study, Executive Summary (San Francisco, California, Olympus Research Centers, 1976) p. 9.

Vocational Education programs. An important part of the follow-up studies has been to determine how well high school graduates of cooperative programs have fared in the labor market.

Robertson's study consisted of a follow-up of 121 graduates who had no formal education beyond high school. Seventy of the graduates had not been involved in cooperative programs at the high school, 51 students were involved as Cooperative Vocational Education students. One of Robertson's findings was that:

Of those employees who had participated in the cooperative education program while in high school, 58.82 percent of them began work immediately after graduation compared with 34.28 percent of the non-cooperative group.¹

In the Molner study conducted for Battelle, 12 school districts, covering three states, were surveyed. Molner found that:

Co-op graduates tend to find full-time employment an average of 1.5 weeks sooner than non-co-op graduates which is a statistically significant difference, but not a practical difference.²

Wilkinson found in comparing cooperative distributive education graduates with non-cooperative distributive education graduates on selected employment factors that students enrolled in cooperative programs obtained jobs faster than the non-co-op student.³

¹ Leonard F. Robertson, "An Exploratory Study of the Effects of Cooperative Education Programs in Beginning Occupations of Selected Employment Factors" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Colorado State College, 1965).

² Daniel E. Molner and others, Cost Effectiveness of Selected Cooperative Vocational Education Programs as Compared with Vocational Programs without a Cooperative Component (Columbus, Battelle Laboratories, 1973), p. 95.

³ Donald R. Wilkinson, "A Comparison Study of Cooperative Distributive Education Graduates with Non-cooperative Distributive Education Graduates on Selected Employment Factors in the State of Iowa" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, 1974).

In the Haines and Coleman Study, 3,932 Michigan high school students were surveyed ten months after graduation to check their status in the labor market. This study was not a comparative study. All students contacted had been involved in Cooperative Vocational Education programs at the time of graduation. The following pertinent information comes from this study:

1. Cooperative trainees fare well in the labor market.
2. Employment is obtained quickly and residual unemployment is low.
3. Trainees are shown to be representative of all levels of academic achievement, and as a total group are superior to their graduating classes as a whole.
4. Large numbers of trainees are still working for the employer who trained them.
5. About one-fifth of the trainees had entered college.
6. Cooperative Education does indeed result in trained employees.¹

In Walsh's comparative follow-up study, 280 participating students in cooperative programs and 302 non-participating students completed interviews with the following findings:

The follow-up study indicates that although the attitudes of high school work education participants were much more positive than non-participants while they were in school, two years later little difference was found between the two groups. Furthermore, the outcomes for high school participants, in terms of current employment status, past year employment stability, wage levels, and job satisfaction, were about the same as those for non-participants

¹Peter G. Haines and Brendan G. Coleman, "How High School Cooperative Trainees Fare in the Labor Market," National Business Education Quarterly, XXXIII (October, 1964), 23-24.

--even though the first jobs obtained by participants paid higher wages than those obtained by non-participants.¹

COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND THE
NON-PROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOL

In the educational amendments of 1976 provision was made under section 123, Cooperative Vocational Education:

To the extent consistent with the number of students enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served, whose educational needs are of the type which the program or project involved is to meet, provision has been made for the participation of such students;¹

Only one major study has evaluated what has taken place since the 1976 Amendments. Wasdyke found that the development of cooperative relationships between private and public schools is impeded by several barriers including:

* The lack of federal, state, and local levels of accurate basic data on private schools and their students

* The absence of data on the extent and nature of private student participation in programs funded under the vocational education amendments of 1976

* Poorly developed communications networks among nonprofit private institutions and between private and public elements and secondary institutions

* Mistrust, misperceptions, negative stereotypes, and philosophical differences on the part of both private and public

¹ John Walsh and Vincent J. Breglio, An Assessment of School Supervised Work Education Programs - Part II: Urban Cooperative Education Programs and Follow-up Study, Executive Summary, (San Francisco: Olympus Research Centers, 1976) p. 36.

² U.S. Congress, Title I, Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, Public Law 94-482, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967). p. 2190.

school officials about the roles of the two kinds of institutions in American society

* State prohibitions, policies, and regulations that discourage and restrict federal assistance to private school students.....¹

Wasdyke concluded that a more cooperative relationship between private and public schools should exist. Joint planning at all levels should begin to take place according to Wasdyke.

COMPARATIVE STUDIES

A number of studies have been conducted to determine if significant relationships exist between success criteria and potential predictors of program success of students enrolled in Cooperative Vocational Education as against vocational students not enrolled in Cooperative Vocational Education. One of the studies reviewed has used identically the same success criteria as a base for the study. A composite list of success criteria for this study include academic achievement, dropout rate for senior students, work values, job satisfaction, employer comparison of the Cooperative Vocational Education versus noncooperative vocational student, and follow-up.

Concerning academic achievement relating to successful criteria used in Cooperative Vocational Education, Mills reviewed 85 high schools in 28 states in the area of Distributive Education. He found that the participants in Cooperative Vocational Education showed a greater

¹ Raymond G. Wasdyke, Providing Students in Nonprofit Schools with Access to Publicly Supported Vocational Education Programs, (Princeton, Educational Testing Service, Final Report to Department of HEW, 1980) pp. 59-61.

tendency to complete high school than did vocational students not involved in cooperative education.

....mental maturity scores and class rank of coop students was low with more than 70 percent in the lower half of their graduating classes; achievement of the coop students compared favorably with their abilities as reflected in their mental maturity scores.

Mills suggests that the above information refutes the charge that students enrolled in Cooperative Vocational Education are prevented from opportunities in receiving a sufficient program of basic general education.¹

Bledsoe completed a similar study comparing the educational development of diversified cooperative education students versus vocational students not included in cooperative programs. There were no statistically significant differences between the experimental and control groups.²

Harper in his study of special education relating to work study programs compared dropouts with continuing students in work-study programs. He studied the characteristics of students with reference to in-school adjustment, post-school adjustment, and vocational success. Dropout students showed less desirable characteristics than the continuing students. Continuing students were found to be more employable than the dropout students. The employers found no

¹Chester O. Mills, "Academic Status of High School Distributive Education Cooperative Students." (Doctoral Study. The Ohio State University, 1963.) DA. 24:2759. pp. 14, 30.

²Harry J. Bledsoe, "A Comparison of the Educational Development of Diversified Cooperative Education Students and Non-Diversified Cooperative Education Students in Selected Indiana High Schools." (Doctoral Study. Purdue University, 1968.) D.A. 29:756-A. pp. 12, 30.

appreciable difference between the dropout student and the work study student in overall job ratings. The continuing student made significantly more successful social adjustment and was found to have a higher vocational competence than his counterpart who had dropped from the program.¹

Wallace draws a comparison to Borows' suggestion that Cooperative Vocational Education should be used to assist all students in the development of this "work ethos."²

In an extensive research study conducted by Bruce Bernstein in 1968, a comparison of work values, using Super's work values inventory, was summarized by Wallace.

For the most part there was little evidence of any work value differences between the co-op and the control students. Correlations between the work values and academic achievement, personal adjustment, and job performance were generally low. Nonetheless there were sufficient findings to encourage further research in the area of work values and to indicate that the study of work values might be a meaningful approach to understanding the vocational development of disadvantaged youth.³

In a comparative national study conducted by Cohen and Frankel it was found that a cooperative education program was more likely than any other work experience program to:

- Provide students with jobs that afford a high degree of satisfaction

¹Dale H. Harper. "A Comparison of Drop-Outs and Continuing Students in Special Education Work-Study Programs for the Mentally Handicapped in Public Secondary Schools. (Doctoral Study, Colorado State College, 1968.) D.A. 29:1039-A. pp. 13, 30.

²Harold R. Wallace. Review and Synthesis of Research on Cooperative Vocational Education. The Center for Vocational and Technical Education. (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1970).

³Bruce H. Bernstein. "A Study of the Work Values of a Group of Disadvantaged High-School Boys in a Co-operative Education Program." (Doctoral Study, New York University, 1968.)

- Help students in deciding on an occupation
- Provide students with jobs that fit into their career plans
- Provide students with a high level of responsibility.¹

The Battelle study indicated that the school dropout rate for non-co-op students was twice as high as students enrolled in cooperative vocational education.

¹ Alan J. Cohen and Steven M. Frankel, An Assessment of School-supervised Work Education Programs, (Santa Monica, System Development Corporation, 1973.)

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the methods used in the selection of the sample for the study, preparation and supervised administration of the instruments, an analysis of the results of the survey, and, finally, a summary of the chapter.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to (1) determine the degree to which secondary cooperative vocational education is a viable ~~training educational method of instruction,~~ (2) assess the degree of priority given by states to the 1976 educational amendments where special instruction is given...to areas that have high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment, as well as high priority to program instruction in the areas of handicapped and disadvantaged, (3) evaluate existing programs in all vocational program areas to determine successful program components of the cooperative method of instruction, and (4) locate "Models" of CVE programs across the country at the secondary level for those wishing to develop strong CVE programs.

There was no attempt to compare Cooperative Vocational Education against other forms of work experience. The study was descriptive in nature.

SELECTION OF JURY

Because the study was undertaken on a national level, it was determined that the selection of a jury of recognized experts in the

field of Cooperative Vocational Education could best select, with given criteria, those states that were most closely following Cooperative Vocational Education program guidelines as originally established under the 1968 Congressional Amendments. Twelve individuals with unique backgrounds with high visibility in cooperative education along with individuals from the United States Office of Education, Vocational and Adult Division, were selected to form the jury (see appendix G for listing of jury members).

Each individual selected for consideration as a jury member was contacted by phone in early November, 1980 to solicit his or her assistance in the selection process for the states to be considered for use in the study. Each individual responded in the affirmative to serving as a member of the jury.

On November 22, 1980 a letter along with criteria to be used in the selection process was sent to each member of the jury. Within four weeks all jury members had responded to the letter (see appendix B for letter and form used).

Responses from members of the jury were received listing in rank order the states for consideration in the study. A simple tabulation indicated those states that would be used in the study.

STATES SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION

The states selected for participation in the study were Arizona, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia.

Introductory phone calls were made in January, 1981 to the State Director of Cooperative Education in each of the states mentioned.

above to verify his or her interest in participating in the study. A follow-up letter was sent to each state director explaining in greater detail the purpose of the study and the part that he or she would be requested to play should the director agree to be a part of the study. After receiving clearance from the vocational director, or higher authority, each of the five states contacted agreed to participate according to the procedures that were indicated in the follow-up letter (see appendix C for the follow-up letter).

SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

Upon the selection of the five states to be used in the study, the State Cooperative Director was asked to select five large, five medium, and five small school districts and high schools within those districts who could participate in the study. A total of 80 high schools were then recommended for participation in the study by the State Cooperative Directors and by program specialists in the five states from the list of school districts. Teacher-coordinators were recommended for participation in the study by state department personnel on the basis of having strong Cooperative Vocational Education programs. All vocational program areas were asked to be represented equally in each state insofar as possible. Also, where possible, each state was requested to make school selections that geographically covered the state. Training sponsors and co-op students participating in the study were recommended by the teacher-coordinators. The teacher-coordinators had received prior instructions on the process used for their selection.

DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUMENTS FOR THE COLLECTION AND RECORDING OF DATA

Data Collection, Teacher-Coordinator Questionnaire

In the literature review care was taken to focus on survey instruments that were developed for similar studies on cooperative education. Federal legislation spelling out the criteria for development of cooperative vocational education programs also became the basis for questionnaire development in the case of the teacher-coordinator questionnaire. The draft of the teacher-coordinator questionnaire was presented to three competent individuals in the field of Cooperative Vocational Education and one expert in research design for constructive criticism. After reviewing their comments, appropriate revisions were made in the instrument for use in the study. The questionnaire was then administered to a sample group of Cooperative Vocational Education Teacher-Coordinators in the Jordan and Salt Lake School Districts in the State of Utah for the specific purpose of gaining further validation of the instrument. The purpose of this sampling was:

- * To determine whether the directions to the questionnaire were clear and precise
- * To determine whether the questions were clear and precise
- * To determine if the questions would solicit appropriate responses of value to the study.

Data Collection, Participating Student Questionnaire and Training Sponsor Questionnaire

After determining specific objectives to be achieved by both the participating student and the training sponsor questionnaire, it was decided that two questionnaires used by System Development Corporation

of Santa Monica, California in their 1973 national study could be employed satisfactorily with minor modifications to obtain some of the responses needed in the collection of data for these two groups.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

When the decision was made to use a survey instrument in the study it was recognized that several methods could be used to gain responses from the instruments used. It was determined that although the method which was selected would add additional costs to the study, the benefits would be superior to the other options available.

In a letter addressed to each of the five state directors of cooperative education participating in the study the following requests were made:

1. Please select an individual or individuals that can conduct a survey with teacher-coordinators in five small, five medium, and five large school districts, keeping in mind the importance of covering as many vocational areas as possible in the selection of the teacher-coordinators who will participate in the study.
2. Each teacher-coordinator will be asked to select at random, two twelfth grade students and two training sponsors presently participating in the cooperative program. The teacher-coordinator will be asked to supervise the completion of a survey instrument to each of the students and training sponsors as selected by them.
3. It will be necessary for me to come to a location designated by you to meet with those you would approve to assist with the study. The purpose of this trip will be to give inservice training to those who will visit onsight with teacher-coordinators in the administration of the questionnaire. It is anticipated that this inservice meeting would take approximately two hours. In trying to coordinate the dates in which I will be in all five states to conduct the inservice training of the interviewers, dates have been selected

that I hope will meet your schedule. One or two alternate dates have been suggested that might be considered as well. At this time please consider the date of Thursday, March 26 as the first date in which I would be at the place designated by you to work with the interviewers and alternate dates of April 1 and 2.

4. It is requested that the interviewers complete their interviews with the teacher-coordinators on or before the twentieth of April and then to have the questionnaires returned immediately to this office for tabulation. Each of the other four states will be meeting similar dates for completion in order for the tabulation of the results from each state to take place.
5. Please select the schools and teacher-coordinators and have the names of the school and list of coordinators returned to this office by Tuesday, March 3. By that date it would be appreciated if you could have confirmed the best date to meet with your interviewers of the dates suggested above.

Two additional letters accompanied the first letter sent to each state cooperative director referred to above. They included:

1. A letter of instruction to those conducting the interview with the teacher-coordinators.
2. A letter of information about the study and instructions to the teacher-coordinator on the procedures to be used in completing the questionnaire.

After receiving the list of schools and names of teacher-coordinators participating in the study from each state, a phone call was made to confirm the dates for the project director to meet with each state staff for inservice instruction on the administration of the survey instrument. A set procedure was followed in the visits to each state by the project director. A one hour meeting was held with the state cooperative director to review in detail all procedures of the study. This was followed by a three hour inservice meeting with those program specialists who would be meeting directly with the teacher-coordinators taking part in the study. Upon completion of

the interview with the teacher-coordinator, the program specialist was asked to return the questionnaire to the project director in a self-addressed, postage metered envelope. The teacher-coordinator's role was then reviewed in detail and the request was made that each teacher-coordinator assist in selecting two co-op students and two training sponsors for participation in the study. Each teacher-coordinator was asked to hand carry a student questionnaire to two students presently enrolled in the Cooperative Vocational Education program at their school and to return the student questionnaire in a self-addressed, postage paid envelope. Each teacher coordinator was also asked to hand carry a training sponsor questionnaire to two current training sponsors. Self-addressed, postage paid envelopes were again provided and the questionnaires were to be sent directly to the project director upon completion by the students and training sponsors.

Each state staff member was encouraged to have all teacher-coordinator questionnaires completed and returned to the project director within three weeks of the time of the inservice meeting in that particular state. State staff members were asked to encourage teacher-coordinators to have all student and training sponsor survey instruments returned within two weeks from the time of their interview with a member of the state staff.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Inservice visits to state staffs took place during the months of March and April, 1981. Follow-up calls were made to three of the

five state cooperative directors to determine if there were any questions that needed clarifying. No other follow-up was done.

Total responses from the three questionnaires from each state were above expectation as indicated in tables 1 and 2 located in Chapter 4.

All questionnaires in each of the three areas as received were considered eligible for use in the study. Some individuals in each area did not complete every question; however, the number of questions not responded to by any one individual was insignificant.

The questionnaire responses in each area, teacher-coordinator, student, and training sponsor were used to identify existing conditions, practices and procedures used in the administration of Cooperative Vocational Education programs at the local high schools in each of the five states.

Number, percentages, means, modes, ranges, standard deviations, and median were determined and computed. Tables were constructed to present the data so they would illustrate the patterns from each set of questionnaires as they emerged. In some instances an analysis of variance was used for additional data clarification.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER

A jury of recognized experts in the area of Cooperative Vocational Education assisted in the selection of five states across the country considered to have superior Cooperative Vocational Education programs.

State directors of cooperative education were contacted in each of the five states for participation in the national study. The directors were asked to select 15 high schools within their state that

had "model" Cooperative Vocational Education programs for participation in the study. Selection of programs for participation covered all vocational areas.

A total of eighty teacher-coordinators from 68 separate high schools in the five states participated in the study as well as 134 students from six vocational program areas and 126 training sponsors representing all vocational program areas in each of the five states.

The selection of teacher-coordinators was done by requesting state cooperative directors and state staff to select 15 cooperative programs considered superior in five large, five medium, and five small high schools (the state of Oklahoma requested an additional five participants which were included in the final totals).

The selection of training sponsors and students for participation was made by participating teacher-coordinators. They selected training sponsors and currently enrolled students in the cooperative program who were committed to the concepts of Cooperative Vocational Education.

A questionnaire return of 94% was received from participating teacher-coordinators with all questionnaires returned being used for the study.

A questionnaire return of 79% was received from training sponsors who participated in the study. All questionnaires in this group were used in the study.

Data received from the five states was then classified. Numbers, percentages, standard deviations, were determined and computed with appropriate table construction to present and illustrate emerging patterns of the study. Appropriate conclusions and recommendations were then established.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

The data presented in Chapter IV were drawn from responses received from three separate questionnaires taken to five separate states participating in the study. Seventy-five teacher-coordinators, one hundred thirty-four students and one hundred twenty-six training sponsors responded and completed questionnaires used in the study. Teacher-coordinators and students participating in the study represented each of the six vocational program areas.

Data from the study for this chapter were categorized in the following sequence:

1. Data from the teacher-coordinator questionnaire.
2. Data from the participating student questionnaire
3. Data from the training sponsor questionnaire.
4. Certain data from a combination of the three questionnaires.
5. Chapter summary.

Overall characteristics of study - Seventy-five teacher coordinators from 68 small, medium and large high schools in five states completed the questionnaire under supervision of an interviewer.

One hundred thirty-four Cooperative Vocational Education students and 126 training sponsors also participated in the study by completing a survey instrument. Members of the state office for Vocational Education in each of the five states participating in the study assisted with the sample selection and administration of the teacher-coordinator questionnaire.

Teacher-coordinators then assisted with the sample selection of students and training sponsors participating in the study.

Characteristics of the teacher-coordinator questionnaire - at the beginning of the questionnaire, commonly used definitions for Cooperative Vocational Programs were given for clarification as the teacher-coordinator completed the questionnaire. The purpose and use of the questionnaire was explained to the teacher-coordinator by the interviewer who took the instrument to the teacher-coordinator at his or her high school for completion.

Vocational program area of teacher coordinator - the first question in the instrument asked teacher-coordinators to indicate the vocational program area where they spent the majority of their teaching/ coordinating time. Table 1 indicates that teacher-coordinators completing

TABLE 1--Final status of participants in National Cooperative Vocational Education Study.

Participants	Questionnaires*							
	Teacher-coordinators		Students		Training sponsor		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Completed questionnaire	75	94	134	83.8	126	79	335	84
Ineligible	2	2.4	6	3.7	4	2.4	12	3
No Response	3	3.6	20	12.5	30	18.6	53	13
Totals	80	100	160	100	169	100	400	100

* Cut-off date for receiving all questionnaires was May 13, 1981. Two teacher-coordinator questionnaires, 6 student and 4 training sponsor questionnaires arrived after this cut-off date and were not included in the totals for the study.

the questionnaire were representative of each of the six vocational program areas. However, the majority of those completing the questionnaire come from the program areas of Business and Office Education, Marketing and Distributive Education and Trade and Industrial Education.

High school size of participating teacher-coordinator - included in instructions given to state staff for selection of schools to be used in the study was the request to select small, medium, and large high schools. The small schools were those considered to have below 1000 students. Schools below 2000 in size were considered to be medium size and those schools above 2000 students were considered to be large high schools.

Table 2 shows the distribution of schools selected for use in the study by size of school, grades 10 through 12. Almost 50 percent of the

TABLE 2.--Number of schools, teacher-coordinators, students and training sponsors in the population by Strata*

Strata	Schools	Participants		
		Teacher Coordinators	Students	Training Sponsors
Large High Schools (3000 students or less)	27	27	54	54
Medium High Schools (2000 students or less)	31	31	62	62
Small High Schools (1000 students or less)	22	22	44	44
Totals	80	80	160	160

* Includes some schools, teachers, students, and training sponsors later determined ineligible.

high schools in the study were of medium size or with student bodies below 2000.

Length of time cooperative program has been in operation -

The average number of years of operation for cooperative programs was 13 years (13.5 mean). Thirty-nine percent of the cooperative programs in this study were in existence ten years or less.

TABLE 3.--Number of years cooperative program has been operating within department (Question 1)

Number of years	Teacher Responses	
	No.	%
1-10	29	39
11-20.	36	48
21-30.	7	9
31-45.	3	4
Totals	75	100

Length of time that a teacher has served as a teacher-coordinator - The average length of time that a teacher had served as a teacher-coordinator was 8½ years. Over half of the 75 teachers had been coordinators for 9 years or more.

TABLE 4.-Length of time that teacher has served as a teacher-coordinator
(Question 2)

Number of years	Teacher Responses	
	No.	%
1-5	24	32
6-10	27	36
11-15.	17	23
16-25.	7	9
Totals	75	100

The title of the person to whom the teacher-coordinator reports - Forty-six percent of the teacher-coordinators responded that they report directly to the principal when relating to Cooperative Vocational Education. The next most often listed person to whom teacher-coordinators reported was the department chairman-supervisor. (35 percent). The largest number of coordinators reported on their program activities in Cooperative Education to the Principal rather than the department chairman or person who is their line supervisor.

TABLE 5.--The title of the person to whom the teacher-coordinator reports
(Question 3)

Title	Teacher Responses	
	No.	%
Principal	33	46
Department chairman/supervisor	25	35
Vocational Director	10	14
Other	4	5
Total	72	100

Inservice classes on Cooperative Vocational Education - When asked to respond to the number of inservice classes or workshops on Cooperative Vocational Education attended during the last three years 69 percent of the teacher-coordinators indicated they had attended four or more. Only one of the 75 had attended no cooperative workshop or courses during the last three years.

TABLE 6.--Number of in-service classes attended during past three years.
(Question 5)

Number of classes	Teacher Responses	
	No.	%
Four or more	52	69
Three	13	17
Two	4	5
One	5	7
None	1	1
Total	75	100

When teacher-coordinators were asked to identify if they had attended classes or workshops where units of instruction on Cooperative Education were given, 72 percent indicated they had attended this type of workshop.

When asked, "To what extent have these classes been productive for you", 52 percent of the teacher-coordinators indicated that classes or workshops attended had been excellent while 5 percent reported in-service classes or workshop had been poor. Forty-two percent of the teachers responded that they had been "good".

Contractual procedures used by school districts for teacher-coordination - Table 7 indicates that sixty-three of the 75 teachers involved in the study responded concerning the way in which they are hired to coordinate cooperative programs. Ninety-one percent responding

TABLE 7.--How teacher-coordinators perform their coordination responsibilities
(Question 8)

Procedures	Teacher Responses *	
	No.	%
Coordinate as part of contract day. . . .	57	91
Coordinate on an extended day - beyond the regular day with no additional pay.	4	6
Coordinate on an extended day - beyond the regular day with additional pay.	2	3
Total	63	100

* Twelve coordinators did not respond to the question

indicated they perform their cooperative duties as part of the contract day. Just 2 teachers indicated that they worked on an extended day with additional pay, and only 4 teachers indicated they were performing coordination responsibilities on an extended day without additional pay.

In Table 8 a state-by-state analysis of the kinds of activities and number of hours spent on coordination is shown.

TABLE 8.--Analysis of the kinds of activities and number of hours spent on coordinating each week (Question 9)

Activity	N = 40	AZ	MN	OH	OK	VA	Total	%
		Mean Hours	Mean Hours	Mean Hours	Mean Hours	Mean Hours	Mean Hours	
Providing training in classroom (related)		6	6	8	9	13	8	20
Visiting training sponsor		6	5	9	5	9	7	17.5
Keeping records and reporting		5	2	5	7	4	4	12.5
Contacting employers about job openings		3	1	3	4	4	3	7.5
Talking with students about cooperative program		2	2	2	3	3	3	7.5
Conducting follow-up of former students		.8	.5	1	3	1	1	2.5
Other cooperative related activities		6	5	5	4	5	5	12.5
Other non-related cooperative activities *		11.2	18.5	7	4	1	8	20
Totals		40	40	40	40	40	40	100

* Includes teaching non-coop classes and non-teaching assignments by administration

The two activities requiring the greatest amount of the teacher-coordinator's time are the teaching of the cooperative related class (8 hours average) and the visiting of the training sponsor (7 hours average). Conducting follow-up of former students consumed the least amount of a teacher-coordinator's time in any given week.

In a comparison by states, Virginia teacher-coordinators spend over twice as much time (13 hours average per week) in teaching the cooperative related class than do coordinators in the states of Arizona and Minnesota. (6 hours average per week)

Teacher-coordinators in Minnesota spend an average of 18.5 hours per week in non-related cooperative functions, including teaching non-cooperative related classes. Teacher-coordinators in the other four states participating in the study spend an average of 6 hours per week in non-cooperative related activities.

When asked if they receive reimbursement for mileage relating to duties of coordination for the program, 86 percent of the teacher-coordinators indicated that they were receiving reimbursement. Eleven percent indicated they received no reimbursement.

Percentage of time allotted to coordination - Table 9 depicts the percent of contract time allocated to the role of teacher-coordinator for Cooperative Vocational Education during the school year. Forty-seven percent of the coordinators allocate 100 percent of their time to Cooperative Vocational Education programs. Thirty-seven percent of the coordinators spent between 40 and 60 percent of their time in coordination activities. Only 7 percent of the coordinators spent 30 percent or less on coordinating activities as a whole.

A state-by-state breakdown of this time allocation to coordinating activities indicates that 12 out of 15 teacher-coordinators in the state of Ohio coordinate 100 percent of their time while 2 out of 15 coordinators spend 50 percent of their time coordinating. The majority of teacher coordinators in Arizona spend between 40-60 percent of their time coordinating. Sixty percent of the coordinators in Oklahoma spend 100 percent of their time coordinating. The majority of Minnesota's teacher-coordinators (55 percent) spend between 40 and 60 percent of their time coordinating. Forty-three percent of Virginia's teacher-coordinators spend 100 percent of their time coordinating.

TABLE 9.--Percentage of contract time allocated to role of teacher-coordinator during school year
(Question 11)

Percent of time	Teacher Responses											
	AZ		MN		OH		OK		VA		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
100 percent. . .	2	13	4	36	12	80	12	60	6	43	36	47
90 percent. . .					1	7	1	5	3	22	5	7
80 percent. . .	1	7									1	1
70 percent. . .												
60 percent. . .	6	40	3	28			1	5	2	14	12	17
50 percent. . .	2	13	2	18	2	13	1	5			7	9
40 percent. . .	3	20	1	9			3	15	2	14	9	12
30 percent. . .			1	9					1	7	2	3
20 percent. . .	1	7					1	5			2	3
10 percent. . .							1	5			1	1
Total	15	100	11	100	15	100	20	100	14	100	75	100

Students taught and coordinated by teacher-coordinators - Table 10 indicates the percentage of students that are coordinated by the teacher and also receive instruction in a related class from the coordinator. Ninety-six percent of the teacher-coordinators responded that 76 percent or more of the students that they coordinate in the cooperative program, they also teach in a formal class setting.

TABLE 10.--Percentage of students who are taught in the formal class setting and coordinated on-the-job by the same teacher-coordinator. (Question 13)

Percentage	Teacher Responses*	
	No.	Adjusted %
100-76.	71	96
75-51	1	1
50-26	2	3
Total	74	100

Length of employment as teacher-coordinator - Table 11 depicts the number of months that a teacher-coordinator is employed with the school district. Fifty-one teacher-coordinators (68 percent) are employed under a ten month contract. Twenty-two teachers (29 percent) are employed eleven or more months as coordinators with 2 teachers being employed as coordinators for 9 months.

11.--Length of time that teachers are employed as coordinators by the district
(Question 14)

Teacher Responses by Program Area

Agriculture Education	Business Education	Distributive Education	Health Education	Home Economics Education	Trade & Industrial Education	Diversi- fied Cooperative	Totals
3	6 19	4 2 16 1	3	1 1	3 4 8	4	7 15 51 2
3	25	23	3	2	15	4	75

In analyzing the hiring of teacher-coordinators by states, it was found that all of Oklahoma's coordinators were on 10-month contracts, and all but one of the coordinators in Ohio was on a 10-month contract. Arizona hires the large majority of their teacher-coordinators on a 10-month contract with the exception of coordinators in agriculture who are hired for 11 months according to the completed questionnaires. Minnesota was split equally between 10- and 11-month contracts for their teacher-coordinators while Virginia hired an equal number of teacher-coordinators on 11- and 12-month contracts according to the survey.

Hours of release time for coordination - Table 12 combines questions 15 and 16 to determine the number of hours that coordinators have for release time to coordinate the cooperative program. The table also lists the number of students that each teacher coordinates.

Eighty-five percent of the teachers are released between 2 and 3 hours each day to coordinate the Cooperative Vocational Education Program.

Sixty-five percent of the teachers coordinate between 10 and 29 students.

The average number of students being coordinated by the teacher-coordinator for each hour of release time is 11 students.

TABLE 12.--Number of students coordinated and number of hours released for coordination (Questions 15, 16)

Number of Students Coordinated	Hours of Release Time for Coordination						Teacher Response	
	1	2	3	4	5	8	No.	%
50-40.		2	6	3			11	14.7
39-30.		5	5	1	1	1	13	17.3
29-20.	3	17	3				23	30.7
19-10.	4	10	12				26	34.7
9-1.	1		1				2	2.6
Total Teachers Responding	8	34	27	4	1	1	75	100

Use of training agreements - The data derived from Table 13 indicates that a high percentage of teacher-coordinators use training agreements and training plans. Ninety-six percent of the teacher-coordinators use training agreements while 82 percent of them use training plans.

TABLE 13.--Use of training agreements and training plans by teacher-coordinators
(Questions 19, 20)

N = 75 Frequency	Training Agreements		Training Plans	
	No.	Adjusted %	No.	Adjusted %
Always	71	96	61	82.4
Usually	3	4	12	16.2
Sometimes			1	1.4
Totals*	74	100	74	100

*One teacher-coordinator failed to respond to this question.

Assignments performed by coordinators - In Table 14, teacher-coordinators were asked to indicate if they performed all of the assignments as listed. As can be derived from the table, the large majority of teacher-coordinators perform all of the tasks as listed.

TABLE 14.--Kinds of assignments performed by teacher-coordinators
(Question 21)

Assignments	Teacher-coordinator responses	
	No.	%
Establish guidelines for CVE program.	72	96
Enroll students in CVE.	72	96
Teach related class	73	97
Assist student to locate training station	74	98
Work with student in completing training agreement	74	98
Work with student in completing training plan.	74	98
Place students on job	74	98
Manage the attendance, transfers, and terminations of coop students	69	92
Call on employer periodically for student evaluation	74	98
Evaluate students who are in program.	74	98
Supervise employer-employee appreciation event.	73	97
Advise student vocational organization.	70	93

Selection of training stations - The data derived from Table 15 indicate that the most frequent means of establishing training stations in the Cooperative Vocational Education Training program is from a visit to the place of business. One hundred percent of the teacher-coordinators indicated that they locate training stations using this method. The second most frequently used method to establish training stations is through the use of the telephone to a potential training sponsor. Only 7 teacher-coordinators indicated that they located training sponsors through contact with the school or District Coop Director.

TABLE 15.--Procedures used to select training stations (Question 22)

Procedures	Teacher Responses*	
	No.	%
Visit place of business and select training station.	75	100
Phone contact.	72	96
Requests by letter	34	45
Contact Employment Security or Job Service	29	39
Receive list of training stations from school coop director.	14	19
Receive list of training stations from district coop director.	7	9
Receive list of training stations from other teacher-coordinators	7	9
Receive list of training stations from other training sponsors	7	9

*Coordinators could respond more than once.

Selection of students by training sponsor - When teacher-coordinators were asked to identify the procedures used by training sponsors to select students for participation in the cooperative program, the majority indicated that they select the students from two or more students supplied by the teacher-coordinator.

Counseling procedures used by coordinators - Teacher-coordinators were asked to identify the methods used in career counseling students who were part of the Cooperative Education program.

Seventy-three teachers indicated that they had career counseled the majority of their students on an individual basis. Sixty-two coordinators indicated that they had also career counseled students using the

group counseling method. Eleven coordinators indicated that they used additional methods to career counsel students but there was no pattern established here. See Table 16.

When asked to indicate on the average, how many students received career counseling during the current year, teachers identified the method and number of students counseled as indicated in Table 16.

TABLE 16.--Methods used for career counseling cooperative vocational education students within the department (check all that apply)
(Question 24)

Method	Teacher Responses	
	No.	%
Individual counseling	73	97
Group counseling	62	83
Other (no pattern was established)	11	15

Student breakout by sex and ethnic origin - From the teacher-coordinator population surveyed in this study, Table 17 shows that over the past three years the teacher-student ratio is decreasing. This table does not take into consideration the hours of release time given to the coordinator to coordinate these students, however.

During the past three years, an increasing number of males and conversely a decreasing number of females are entering the cooperative programs.

Concerning the ethnic breakout, 91 percent of the total Coop population are white in 1980-81 compared to 86 percent two years ago.

TABLE 17.--Breakout of

There were more teachers responding to this question for the year 1980-81 than for previous years for two reasons: First, access to enrollment information was limited in previous years; and second, some teachers had not been employed during the time when enrollment information was requested.

Admittance procedures for students entering Cooperative

Program - Fifty-six percent of the teacher-coordinators indicated that the students must be in at least the twelfth grade before they can be admitted to the cooperative program.

Eighty-two percent of the teachers of the population require the student to be at least 16 years of age before being admitted to the cooperative program. Forty-nine percent of the teachers indicated that students in their cooperative programs have developed an occupation

TABLE 18. --Teacher-coordinator response to admittance procedures for students entering Cooperative Vocational Education (Question 27)

Procedures	Grade		Age			Most Always	Some- Often times	Seldom	Teacher Responses*		
	11	12	15	16	17				No.	%	
Students must be at least grade	32	41							73	97	
Age of student must be at least			10	60	3				73	97	
Student has an occupational or vocational interest						27	36	9	1	73	97

*Three teachers failed to respond to this question.

intent before beginning the cooperative program. Only 10 teachers indicated that their students sometimes or seldom have declared a vocational or career intent.

Instruction methods in related class - Table 19 depicts the methods of instruction used in the related class. All 73 teacher-coordinators responding to question 30 use the lecture method as the most prevalent form of instruction. Ninety-two percent reported using the individual or small group method as the second most popular form of instruction. The least popular form of instruction used by teacher-coordinators was programmed instruction with 75 percent using this kind of instruction.

TABLE 19.--Analysis of whether the students receive training in a related class by specific methods of instruction (Question 30)

Method	Teacher Response		
	Yes	No	Total
Lectures	73		73
Individual or small group	69	6	75
Large group instruction	66	9	75
Informal non-teacher centered instruction	64	11	75
Role playing	59	16	75
Programmed instruction	56	19	75

Cooperative program requirements - According to data in Table 20 teacher-coordinators feel that they are given sufficient release time to coordinate their cooperative programs. Ninety-six percent (or 71 coordinators) indicated that their students all receive the minimum wage or student learner wage as a student participant of the cooperative program.

Over 91 percent of the coordinators require training plans, training agreements, and that the student and/or training sponsor is visited for purposes of coordination at least every six weeks. Ninety-one percent of the coordinators also indicated that their

TABLE 20.--Indicate whether or not the following are required as part of the Cooperative program (Question 29)

Program Requirements	Teacher Responses		
	Yes	No	Total
N = 75			
The teacher-coordinator is given sufficient release time from teaching responsibilities to coordinate the cooperative program.	74	1	75
Cooperative students receive at least the minimum wage or student learner wage.	71	4	75
A training plan is completed and signed by the employer, student and school	70	4	74
The student and/or supervisor are visited on site by a teacher-coordinator at least every six weeks	68	7	75
The teacher-student ratio is not greater than 25-1 per hour of release time.	68	7	75
A training agreement is signed by the employer, student, and school	66	8	75
The student receives one or more years of inschool vocational training before being admitted to cooperative training.	23	50	73



student-teacher ratio per one hour of release time was not greater than 25 to 1.

One note of interest was that only 32 percent of the coordinators require one or more years of in-service vocational training before the student can be admitted to cooperative training.

Student entrance into Cooperative Vocational Education - the data from Table 21 indicate that the large majority of students entering cooperative programs are placed by the school counselor with the approval of the teacher-coordinator. Of 67 teachers responding to question 28 in Table 21, 60 of them (or 90 percent) approve counselor recommendation for students to enter cooperative programs.

TABLE 21.--Indication of how students are received into Cooperative Education program (Question 28)

Method	Teacher Response	
	No.	Adjusted %*
School counselor places students into program with teacher approval	60	90
School counselor places students into program without teacher approval	7	10
Total	67*	100

* 67 out of 75 teacher-coordinators responded to this question.

Instruction content, related class - Table 22 indicates the content of the instruction received by students enrolled in the cooperative related class (Question 31 - check all that apply). All coordinators indicated that the teaching of attitudes and employer-employee relationships were high priority for content in the related class.

Ninety-nine percent of the teacher coordinators indicated they teach communication skills and payroll procedures to the students as part of the related class. The least number of coordinators, although still high (92 percent) indicated they taught vocational skills as part of the content of the related class.

TABLE 22.--Analysis of content of instruction cooperative students receive in the related class (check all that apply)
(Question 31)

Class content	Teacher Response	
	No.	%
Attitudes	75	100
Employer-employee relationships	75	100
Communication skills	74	99
Payroll procedures	74	99
Employee-customer relations	72	97
Methods of dress	72	97
Information on current technology	71	95
Economic information	71	95
Academically related instruction	70	93
Vocational skill training	69	92

Percent of student time spent in school and on the job - Fifty-one percent of the teachers in Table 23 indicated that students spend equally as much time at their training station as they do at school. An additional 15* percent of the coordinators indicated that the students spent more time (ranging from 60 to 80 percent of their time) in school. Twenty percent of the coordinators indicated that students spent more time at the training station (ranging from 60 to 80 percent) than at school.

TABLE 23.--Percent of time that students enrolled in Cooperative program spend in school and at training station (Question 32)

Percent of time spent in school (vs percent of time at training station)	Teacher response Concerning students	
	No.	Adjusted %
80.	2	3
70.	9	12
60.	10	14
50.	37	51
40.	6	9
30.	7	10
20.	1	1
Total *	72	100

* Three teachers did not respond to this question.

Remuneration given to cooperative students - Table 24 depicts the total number of students coordinated by teacher-coordinators of the population and the type of wages they receive under the Cooperative

DEFINITIONS:

In order to assure uniformity of responses, please refer to the following definitions:

Cooperative Vocational Education - A program of vocational education for persons who, through written cooperative arrangements between the school and employers, receive instruction, including required academic courses and related vocational instruction by alternation of study in school with a job in any occupational field, but these two experiences must be planned and supervised by the school and employers so that each contributes to the student's education and to his or her employability. (P.L. 94-482)

Training Agreement - A document signed by the student, employer, and teacher-coordinator clarifying the responsibilities of each and defining the length, time and hours, and rate of pay for the work experience.

Training Plan - Determines the specific learning experiences which will be provided on the job and the specific related learning which will be covered in school.

Teacher-Coordinator - The member of the school faculty who teaches and supervises the students participating in a cooperative education program.

Training Station - The location of the work and the employer cooperating with the school in the cooperative education program.

Training Sponsor - The job supervisor who is directly responsible for the training and supervision of the student-trainee.

Number of students in school _____

Today's Date _____

DISTRICT

District Name _____

Superintendent _____

Number of high schools in district _____

In terms of comparing your school size to others in the district, is your school in the

Larger 1/3 _____

Medium 1/3 _____

Smaller 1/3 _____

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION STUDY

TEACHER-COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE - SECONDARY PROGRAMS

Please indicate the vocational program area where you spend the majority of your teaching/coordinating time by checking (✓) one of the following.

- a. Agriculture
- b. Business & Office
- c. Distributive Education
- d. Health Education
- e. Home Economics
- f. Trade & Industrial
- g. Technical education

Official title of program (e.g., Cooperative Office Education, etc.)

Name of Respondent _____

Title of Respondent _____

Office Telephone Number _____

Area code number extension

Please complete the following information relating to your school and district:

SCHOOL

School Name _____

Complete Address _____

1. How long has your cooperative vocational education program been operating within the department?
_____ years.
2. How long have you been a teacher-coordinator?
_____ years (if less than one year-mark one year)
3. As a teacher-coordinator, what is the title of the person to whom you report?
(If you have an organization chart please attach it to this questionnaire.)

(e.g., Dept. Chairman, School
Coop. Dir., Counselor).
4. If you coordinate more than one vocational program area in cooperative education indicate each one below:
- a. _____ Agriculture
 - b. _____ Business & office education
 - c. _____ Distributive Education
 - d. _____ Health
 - e. _____ Home Ec.
 - f. _____ Trade & Industrial
 - g. _____ Technical Education
5. During the last three years, how many inservice classes or workshops on cooperative vocational education have you attended?
- a. _____ Four or more
 - b. _____ Three
 - c. _____ Two
 - d. _____ one
 - e. _____ None
6. Did you attend any workshops or inservice classes on vocational education where units of instruction related to Co-op?
- a. _____ Yes
 - b. _____ No
7. To what extent have these classes or workshops on coop been productive for you?
- a. _____ Excellent
 - b. _____ Good
 - c. _____ Fair

8. As a teacher-coordinator, do you coordinate:
- ___ As part of your contract day
 - ___ On an extended day - beyond the regular day with additional pay
 - ___ On an extended day - beyond the regular day with no additional pay
 - ___ Other (Please explain) _____

9. Of the hours you spend on coordinating activities per week, how many of those are spent:

Providing training, in the classroom setting, to cooperative students?

- a. ___ Hours per week

Talking with the students about specific job opportunities?

- b. ___ Hours per week

Contacting employers about job openings for students?

- c. ___ Hours per week

Conducting follow-up of former students?

- d. ___ Hours per week

Keeping records and reporting activities?

- e. ___ Hours per week

Other: Please specify: _____

- f. ___ Hours per week

10. As a teacher-coordinator do you receive:

a. ___ Reimbursement for local mileage in coordination with duties.

b. ___ No reimbursement for mileage in connection with coordination duties

c. ___ Other (Explain) _____

11. What percent of your contract time is allocated to the role of teacher coordinator for cooperative vocational education during the school year?

- a. 10%
- b. 20%
- c. 30%
- d. 40%
- e. 50%
- f. 60%
- g. 70%
- h. 80%
- i. 90%
- j. 100%

12. List other teaching assignments you have this school year.

13. In your role as teacher-coordinator, what percent of the students that you coordinate, do you teach in the formal classroom setting?

- a. 100% to 75%
- b. 75% to 51%
- c. 50% to 26%
- d. 25% to 1%
- e. None

14. Please list the school contract time you are employed as a teacher-coordinator this year: (e.g., 3 months, 6 months, etc.)

15. How many students do you coordinate in your co-op program?



16. How many hours of release time are you given each day for coordination?
_____.

17. Have you developed measurable program objectives for your departments' cooperative program this year?

a. Yes

b. No

18. As a basis for evaluating student performance, have you developed specific written measurable objectives for students enrolled in your cooperative program?

a. Yes

b. No

1. If your answer to the above question was yes, are the students aware of these objectives?

a. Always

b. Usually

c. Sometimes

d. Seldom

e. Never

2. Are these objectives shared with your training sponsors?

a. Always

b. Usually

c. Sometimes

d. Seldom

e. Never

19. Do you use training plans for cooperative students under your direction? (By definition the training plan determines, with the student, the needed learning experiences which the training sponsor will support).

a. Always

b. Usually

c. Sometimes

d. Seldom

e. Never

20. Do you use training agreements for cooperative students under your direction? (By definition the training agreements determines, with the student, school and training sponsor the wages, work schedule, and agreements with the school, sponsor and student).

- a. Always
- b. Usually
- c. Sometimes
- d. Seldom
- e. Never

21. In the following list, please check all assignments you perform as a teacher-coordinator:

- a. Establish guidelines for the cooperative education program
 - b. Enroll students in the cooperative program
 - c. Teach related class
 - d. Assist student to locate training station
 - e. Work with student in completing training plan
 - f. Work with student in completing training agreement
 - g. Place students on the job
 - h. Manage the attendance, transfers, and terminations of co-op students
 - i. Call on employer periodically for student evaluation
 - j. Evaluate students who are in the program
 - k. Supervise employer-employee appreciation event
 - l. Advise student vocational organization (i.g., VICA, FBLA, DE, ETC.)
 - m. Other (Indicate additional assignments you perform as a teacher-coordinator.)
-
-

22. Please check any of the following that are included in the procedures you use to select training stations for your program:
- a. Visit place of business and select training station
 - b. Phone contact
 - c. Requests by letter
 - d. Receiving lists of training stations from school coop director or counselor
 - e. Receiving lists of training stations from district coop director
 - f. Contact employment security or job service
 - g. Other (please indicate) _____
-
23. What method do you provide for training sponsors to screen your students for part-time employment?
- a. I ask the sponsor what type of student they are looking for and send two or more students and have them make the selection.
 - b. I ask the sponsor what type of student they are looking for and then select one of my students to send the sponsor.
 - c. Other (Please describe if different from above)
24. What method do you use for career counseling the cooperative vocational education students in your department? (check all that apply)
- a. Group counseling
 - b. Individual Counseling
 - c. None
 - d. Other (Please clarify) _____
-
25. How many cooperative students have met with you in counseling this year?
- a. Group (number)
 - b. Individual (number)
 - c. None
 - d. Other

26. During the school year periods from 1977-1980, please complete the following, relating to the number of students who were or are in your department as cooperative vocational education students.

	Students	Male	Female	Breakdown by number
1977-78	_____	_____	_____	172/4:24-25 _____ White
				173/4:26-27 _____ Black
				174/4:28-29 _____ Oriental
				175/4:30-31 _____ Hispanic (Chicano, P. Rican, etc.)
				176/4:32-33 _____ American Indian
				177/4:34-35 _____ Other (specify) _____
1978-79	_____	_____	_____	178/4:36-37 _____ White
				179/4:38-39 _____ Black
				180/4:40-41 _____ Oriental
				181/4:42-43 _____ Hispanic
				182/4:44-45 _____ American Indian
				183/4:46-47 _____ Other (specify) _____
1979-80	_____	_____	_____	184/4:48-49 _____ White
				185/4:50-51 _____ Black
				186/4:52-53 _____ Oriental
				187/4:54-55 _____ Hispanic
				188/4:56-57 _____ American Indian
				189/4:58-59 _____ Other (specify) _____
1980-81	_____	_____	_____	190/4:60-61 _____ White
				191/4:62-63 _____ Black
				192/4:64-65 _____ Oriental
				193/4:66-67 _____ Hispanic
				194/4:68-69 _____ American Indian
				195/4:70-71 _____ Other (specify) _____

If you were not a teacher-coordinator during all of the above years try to furnish the information to the best of your knowledge, relating to departmental information if available.

27. In order for a student to be admitted to your cooperative program please check the following:

The student must be in at least

a. Grade 11

b. Grade 12

The age of the student must be at least

a. 15 years old

b. 16 years old

c. 17 years old

The student has an occupational or vocational intent

a. Always

b. Most often

c. Sometimes

d. Seldom

e. Never

28. Please indicate by the following choices, how you receive students into your cooperative program: (check all choices that apply)

a. School Counselor places them in your program upon your approval.

b. School counselor places them in your program without consulting with you.

c. Students contact you directly without school counseling.

d. Other

If other, please explain briefly _____

29. The following is a list of program requirements for cooperative vocational education. Please check whether or not you require these of students entering your cooperative program:

a. Students receive one or more years of inschool vocational training prior to the cooperative experience in his or her speciality area.

Yes

No

b. Students participating in the vocational cooperative program are paid at least the legal minimum wage or student learner rate established by the Department of labor.

Yes

No

c. A training plan is completed and signed by the employer, student and school, identifying the job site activities that the student will be involved with.

Yes

No

d. A training agreement, also signed by the employer student, and school spells out the time of day in which the student will be employed, the hourly wage, length of employment, etc.

Yes

No

e. The student and/or immediate supervisor of the student are visited by the teacher-coordinator at the training station at least every six weeks for purposes of coordination of the overall program.

Yes

No

f. The teacher-coordinator is given sufficient release time from teaching responsibilities to effectively coordinate the cooperative vocational education program.

Yes

No

g. The teacher-student ratio is not greater than 25-1 per hour of release time.

Yes

No

h. Other (Please add anything that may clarify your answers as checked above.)

30. Do students enrolled in cooperative programs receive training in a related instruction class?

a. Yes

b. No

If your answer was yes, please check the methods of instruction that the students receive:

a. Lectures

b. Programmed instruction

c. Informal non-teacher centered instruction

d. Individual or small groups

e. Large group instruction

f. Role playing

31. In terms of content, students receive instruction in the following: (check all that apply)

a. Employer-employee relationships

b. Communications skills

c. Methods of dress

d. Payroll Procedures

e. Academically related instruction

f. Employer-customer relationships

g. Information on current technology

h. Economic information

i. Vocational skill training

j. Attitudes

k. Other (please list) _____

32. What percent of time does the majority of students who are enrolled in your cooperative program spend in school and on the job?

a. In school _____%

b. On the job _____%

33. How many of your students receive: (list number)

- Minimum wage
 Student learner wage
 No wage

34. What influence has the cooperative program had on students regarding:

Motivation

- a. Great deal of influence
b. Some influence
c. Little influence
d. Undetermined influence
e. No influence

Absenteeism

- a. Great deal of influence
b. Some influence
c. Little influence
d. Undetermined influence
e. No influence

Grades

- a. Great deal of influence
b. Some influence
c. Little influence
d. Undetermined influence
e. No influence

Other (Please explain)

35. To what degree has your cooperative vocational education program directly influenced some students to remain in school rather than drop out?

- a. A great deal of influence in holding students.
b. Some influence in holding students
c. Little influence in holding students
d. No influence in holding students
e. An undetermined influence in holding students

36. Are there placement services provided within the school for students who wish to seek full time employment upon completion of their cooperative training at the high school?

- a. A placement is provided for all students seeking full time employment.
- b. A limited placement program is available for those students who have received vocational or career training.
- c. No placement service is provided.
- d. Other _____

37. Have some students dropped out or been terminated from the cooperative program this year?

- a. Yes
- b. No

If your answer to the above question was yes, how many? _____

38. Were the following reasons why students left cooperative program?

a. Would not follow program requirements

- Yes
- No

b. Had to change because of a schedule conflict

- Yes
- No

c. Employer terminated employment of student

- Yes
- No

d. Teacher-coordinator terminated student from program

- Yes
- No

e. Student lost interest in program

- Yes
- No

f. Student terminated program for personal reasons

- Yes
- No

g. Other (Please list additional reasons for the student leaving the cooperative program) _____

- Yes

39. Please describe the follow-up program for students formerly enrolled in your cooperative program by selecting one of the following options:
- a. Contact of student is made by: Administration (School Coop Coordinator, etc.)
 - b. Contact of student is made by: District
 - c. Contact of student is made by: School counselor
 - d. Contact of student is made by: Department
 - e. Contact of student is made by: Teacher-coordinator
 - f. We do not presently follow-up former students
 - g. I am not acquainted with the process used

40. How often if follow up program conducted in your school for graduating students of cooperative vocational education:

- a. Every year
- b. Every Two years
- c. Every five years
- d. I do not know

41. Do you have provisions in your schools cooperative vocational education program for special populations, (Disadvantaged, handicapped, etc.):

- a. Yes
- b. No

If yes, please provide your answer for those provisions

42. How many disadvantaged and handicapped students are enrolled in your cooperative program this year?

- a. Disadvantaged
- b. Handicapped

Areas that have high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment, receive high priority for funding cooperative vocational education. Programs at the federal level.

43. What has your school cooperative vocational program done to meet the requirements of the federal law?

- a. We do have a plan and are concentrating on these two areas.
- b. We do not have plan at this time to serve these students.

If you checked a above, identify the number of students who are in your program who are potential dropouts _____

44. Please describe the facilities used by your department program for cooperative education as they relate to current needs of business and industry:

GOOD FEATURESPOOR FEATURESSCHOOL TRAINING FACILITIES

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>A. _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> | <p>A. _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> |
|---|---|

ON-SITE TRAINING STATIONS

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>B. _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> | <p>B. _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> |
|---|---|

45. To what extent has the vocational advisory committee contributed to program improvement in your area?

- a. ___ Very frequently
- b. ___ Frequently
- c. ___ Sometimes
- d. ___ Rarely
- e. ___ Never

46. How many times has your school vocational advisory committee met this current school year?

- a. ___ Three or more times
- b. ___ Twice
- c. ___ Once
- d. ___ None
- e. ___ Do not have one

47. If your opinion, to what extent have unions assisted your cooperative vocational education program?

- a. ___ Most helpful in helping our program to increase in size
- b. ___ Somewhat helpful in assisting our program to increase in size
- c. ___ No visible assistance from unions that we can determine to assist our programs to increase in size
- d. ___ Unions have hindered program improvement

Comment: _____

48. Because your school has been identified as having a model cooperative vocational education program, please briefly name the most interesting and unusual feature(s) of your cooperative vocational education program:

49. Please briefly list the main reasons for the degree of success that has been achieved by your cooperative vocational education program?

50. What problems need to be resolved in your cooperative vocational program?

Comment:

51. On a 5-point scale from poor to excellent, with 1 for poor and 5 for excellent, rate your cooperative program on each of the following: ✓

	Average					Don't Know	Not Applicable
	Poor 1	2	3	4	Excellent 5		
a. Student enthusiasm toward cooperative program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. My enthusiasm toward cooperative program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Quality of training sponsor supervision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Relevance of training to real world working conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Cooperation of training sponsors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Cooperation of unions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Intellectual ability of students in their field	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Recruitment of students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Job success of students in program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Counseling within the department for coop student	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Placement of students in same area of training after program completion.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Students continuing post secondary training in same area as received in high school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Follow-up on former students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Job success of students <u>completing</u> program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. Overall quality of cooperative program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Active use of vocational advisory committees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q. Support of other faculty within department of program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
r. Administrative support of the cooperative program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
s. Administrative commitment to cooperative education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thank you for assisting in this national study on cooperative vocational education.

Please check the box below if you desire a summary of the study.

Please indicate the length of time it took to complete this questionnaire



Appendix E

NATIONAL STUDY - COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Why we need your help . . .

Your school system is helping in a national study on vocational education. You have been selected as a representative of Cooperative Education students to help with this job placement study. Your answers are very important, and will help to improve vocational education in your school system.

How can you help . . .

On the next page, you will find questions about cooperative vocational education. Most answers can be indicated by placing a check mark "✓" in the box, or by filling in the blanks. Please answer all items as accurately as possible.

Please return the completed questionnaire to your teacher-coordinator.

Thank you for your help.

This information is CONFIDENTIAL; no data will be associated with the name of an individual.

STUDENT

NATIONAL STUDY COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Set II - March - 1981

Program _____

Institution _____

Date _____

.D. NUMBER _____

PARTICIPATING STUDENT - SENIOR

NOTE STUDENT: NONE OF THIS INFORMATION WILL BE SHARED WITH YOUR SCHOOL OR EMPLOYER.

1. Name _____

2. School attending _____

3. State _____

4. Grade _____

5. Are you: (Check only one in each column)

a. Male

Female

b. Married

Single

c. White

Black

Oriental

Hispanic (Chicano, Puerto Rican, etc.)

American Indian

Other (specify) _____

6. Date of Birth _____
 _____ Month _____ day _____ year

7. What category best classifies your overall school standing by way of grades?

- A (90 +)
 B (80-90)
 C (70-80)
 D (60-70)
 F (below 60)

8. What was your main reason for joining this program? (check only one)

- a. Needed work for pay
 b. Bored with school
 c. Wanted training for job
 d. Wanted to sample occupations
 e. School policy
 f. Other (specify) _____

9. Who first told you about the cooperative vocational education program?

- a. Teacher
 b. Principal
 c. Counselor
 d. Parent or relative
 e. Friend
 f. Employer
 g. Newspaper
 h. Poster
 i. Other (specify) _____

10. How many months have you been working in the program?

_____ months.

11. How often are you supposed to go to your work assignment?

a. Every day

b. Every other day

c. Every day - every other week

d. Every other week - every other day

e. Other (specify) _____

12. How many hours a week are you supposed to work at your job? _____ hours.

13. How many hours are you in regular classes every week?
_____ hours.

14. Are you paid for your work?

a. Yes

No

b. What is your hourly pay? \$ _____/hour.

c. What was your beginning hourly pay? \$ _____/hour.

15. Has the Cooperative Vocational Education program helped you to decide on an occupation?
- a. Definitely
 - b. Much better prepared to make career decision because of my cooperative experience
 - c. Somewhat better prepared for career choice
 - d. No change in my thinking about career because of cooperative experience
 - e. I am more confused about a career since enrolling in coop
16. How closely is your work related to your classwork?
- a. Very closely
 - b. Closely
 - c. Somewhat
 - d. Little
 - e. Not at all
17. On the whole, does this job fit in well with your overall job and career interests?
- a. Fits very well
 - b. Fits well
 - c. Fits moderately well
 - d. Fits only a little
 - e. Doesn't fit at all.

18. Did you like school?
- a. Better before you got into program?
 - b. Better after you got into program?
 - c. About the same after as before you got into the program?
19. What is the name of the company you work for?

20. What does the company you work for make or do?

21. What is your job title? _____
22. What do you do (job description)? _____

23. Where have you learned the most about the skills needed for your job?
- a. At school
 - b. Training station
 - c. From parents or relatives
 - d. On jobs held before you entered the cooperative ed program.
 - e. Elsewhere (specify) _____

24. Do you expect to find a full time job in the occupation in which you are now working?

a. Yes

b. No

With the same employer?

a. Yes

b. No

25. What do you expect to be doing one year from now?

a. Working full time

b. In high school

c. In a 4-year college

d. In a 2-year community college or technical school

e. In a trade school (2 years or less program)

f. In armed services

g. Other (specify) _____

h. Don't know

If you will be in school one year from now, do you plan to be:

a. Working full time and going to school part-time

b. Working full time and going to school full time

c. Working part-time and going to school part-time

d. Working part-time and going to school full time

e. Don't know