This study reviews the literature of marketing programs and classifies it into the following categories: (1) studies related to the General College of the University of Minnesota, (2) studies related to comparing background characteristics of college populations, (3) studies related to post-high school distributive education programs, and (4) other related studies, such as measurements of job satisfaction and follow-up studies. The selected bibliography includes only the literature which compares students enrolled in a 2-year marketing program with students enrolled in a more general curriculum. Of the 30 entries, 18 are theses, four are books, three are articles from professional journals, and five are independent studies. (DC)
MARKETING PROGRAMS: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

by

Roger A. Larson

The major purpose of this publication is to present reports which reflect the two-year program of the General College and the research interests of its faculty. The studies vary, both in content and method. Readers may recall that many of our past issues dealt with research which was theoretical in nature, formal in design, and statistical in technique. Some other reports have been less formal, less statistical, and more descriptive in nature. This issue of The General College Studies is of the latter kind. As such, it exemplifies again the dimensions of our interpretation of the term "studies".

The material presented here originated in work begun at Ohio State University in 1966. In that year, Dr. Roger Larson, head of the Division of Business Studies in the General College, was granted leave from his teaching duties to become a member of a team working in a project designed to collect and review all of the literature in the field of distributive education. The project culminated in the well-known review and synthesis by Meyer and Logan which was published in 1967 by Ohio State.

Later, in the course of collecting data for a study of students enrolled in a General College retailing and selling sequence (see General College Studies, volume 4, number 2), Dr. Larson drew upon the Meyer and Logan bibliography, and read and annotated all of the titles relating to marketing programs. His "review of the literature" makes up this issue of The General College Studies.
MARKETING PROGRAMS: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

As part of an increased emphasis on community involvement, the General College is attempting to expand its offerings in occupational education. One important part of the currently developing occupational programs is the General College's one-year retailing and selling sequence. A prime objective of marketing programs in general is to provide training that will enable graduates of the program to enter, and to advance in, a specific business-related field. Whether or not such programs achieve their aim is extremely difficult to measure. In the broad field of distributive education, numerous researchers and teachers have investigated the employment history of former students in an attempt to judge the effectiveness of their occupational training. Few studies, however, have concerned themselves with comparing employment patterns of graduates of specific vocational programs with employment patterns of graduates of a general education program like that of the General College. Similarly, there are relatively few studies dealing with some important background factors of enrollees in specific vocational programs as compared to the same factors in general education students. Nevertheless, there are some studies in the literature on marketing that are related to such comparisons and that are relevant here on the basis of their concern with a student population like that of the General College or on the basis of similar research techniques. This survey attempts to review the literature of marketing programs and to classify it into the following four categories:

(1) studies related to the General College and its students

(2) studies related to comparing background characteristics of college populations
(3) studies related to post-high school distributive education programs; and

(4) other related studies.

Since its organization in 1932 the General College has been greatly concerned with research relating to its programs and students. In 1935, the first extensive research project was undertaken, supported by a grant from the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation. The purpose of the project was to increase available knowledge about the students to be served by the General College so that its resources might be better fitted to their abilities, needs, interests and backgrounds. This study, which was conducted over a five-year period, made possible the preparation and publication of the following four books: They Went to College: A Study of 951 Former University Students by C. Robert Pace; These We Teach: A Study of General College Students by Cornelia T. Williams; Building a Curriculum for General Education: A Description of the General College Program by Ivol Spafford and others; and Outcomes of General Education: An Appraisal of the General College Program by Ruth E. Eckert. Of these, Cornelia Williams' book, published in 1943, describes the aspects of the Rockefeller study that are most important to the study now being undertaken. Based on intensive investigation of the student population for the 1935-36 academic year, Williams described in great detail the kind of student the General College was serving. She found that the General College student, so far as could be determined, generally was representative of many junior college students who aspire to, but who exhibit low potential for, transfer to four-year college programs; who express vocational aims that are overly-ambitious in relation to their abilities and interests; but who, at the same time, possess in greater measure than their more scholastically-talented schoolmates, other abilities and interests for which little provision is made at the college level.
Based on this research of the 1930's, the General College in the years following attempted to revise and improve its program to better align it with the current and future needs of its students. A direct outcome was a series of less formal studies, made by various faculty members of the General College, which identified a need for college level training in business occupations, particularly those in the area of retail store sales and management. This need was expressed directly by students and also indicated by the nature of their employment after leaving the General College. These studies led to the establishment of the General College Retailing and Selling Program in 1945. At the time the program was started, provision was made for periodic evaluations to determine the extent to which the stated objectives of the program were being achieved. Consequently, in 1947 Miss Evelyn Determan began a study based upon the first two graduating classes of the program.

The purpose of Determan's study (1949) was to examine the results of the sequence in terms of the benefits to the students in occupational preparation and general education. The specific areas investigated were: (1) the store-experience phase of the program; (2) the student guidance features of the program; (3) contribution of the program toward consumer education; (4) identification of problems in the administration and coordination of the course; (5) establishing the related importance of course activities and content; and (6) a survey of the desirability of developing a retailing club. Of the above listed areas, the first two, concerning the work experience aspect of the program and the implication for student guidance, are the areas which relate most closely to this study.

Student responses in Determan's study indicated that the internship requirement was an essential part of the Retailing and Selling program and that the opportunity to learn salesmanship and store operation was more important to students than the salary they earned. These conclusions were in
contrast to the findings of Banks (1946); Determan thought this contrast might imply a difference between the internship objectives of high school and junior college students. Determan also found that the larger stores were more likely to retain the student worker after graduation than the smaller stores. She concluded that:

Continual employment without an interval of layoff while taking the course, the advantage of having a variety of types of work to offer and a need for a large number of employees were probably factors that influenced the retaining ability of the large stores.

Determan did find aspects of the Retailing and Selling program that indicated some dissatisfaction by former participants. Students had the feeling that employers were uninterested in them as permanent employees; she attributed this attitude to a weakness in the employer-employee relationships. Job terminations for the students were high, both during the time they were student-trainees and following their completion of the program. The most common reasons given for job terminations were "to find another job" and "to return to school on a full-time basis." Despite the fact that the program was conceived as a two-year vocational, terminal program, Determan's study showed that, when compared with other General College graduates, a larger number of the retailing and selling graduates continued their education in more specialized lines after receiving the Associate in Arts degree. Determan recommended that a comparative study be conducted to determine the relative merits of a vocational sequence of Retailing and Selling offered with or without a work experience requirement; however, a study of this nature has not as yet been made.

In a later study, Crisp (formerly Miss Determan) and Goodenough (1964) followed up former General College students three to ten years after they had graduated from the program. The purpose of the study was to solicit opinions and suggestions about the topics covered in the three-quarter
Retailing and Selling sequence and about more general questions pertaining to the program. This study, however, was undertaken primarily for purposes of curriculum evaluation and modification rather than for the purpose of eliciting information about student characteristics or employment patterns.

During the middle and latter 1950's the General College was confronted with a situation that has been best described by Benson (1966):

As part of the nationwide college and university population explosion, the enrollment pressure on the General College was a consequence of the accelerating social demand that all young people receive education beyond high school. This demand stemmed from two significant and related assumptions: first, the almost universal conviction of students and their parents that the chief value of education after high school is its worth in the market place, and second, the ubiquitous belief that four years of college are better than two. However, as the demand for the education of larger numbers of students was rising, the educational requirements for admission to four-year, professional, and graduate level programs was rising correspondingly. Thus, in the General College, there was sensed a widening of the gap between the educational and vocational aspirations of its students and the educational and vocational promise that could be made for the two-year program that was being offered.

As a result of these developments, in 1957 the General College was forced to ask itself many of the same questions that it had in the earlier years of the College: What is our present student population like? Is it still representative of a much larger segment of young people seeking higher education? What happens to our students after they leave the General College? What are they doing five, even ten years later? Of what value has their education been to them personally, socially and vocationally? In what ways may the College program be modified to more adequately serve their present and future needs?

To find answers to these questions, a random sample of 300 students was selected from students matriculating in the General College in fall quarter, 1958. The students selected for the follow-up were informed that they were
included in the study when they were enrolled. During their first quarter in the General College each student was interviewed, and from the interviews and their personnel records a complete profile was prepared consisting of 116 items of information. Those students who remained in the College were interviewed at the end of both their first and second years. Those who left the College before completing two years were periodically contacted by the use of questionnaires. When the interviews were completed, a coding system for judging the interview form was developed. The interview form was judged, and for each interview a computer tabulation of the responses to the interview was compiled. At the time of entry into the College, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) was administered to each student. Norms for General College students were established for each occupation on the SVIB, and a computer program was developed for determining occupational group patterns. Continual contact was maintained with the students from Spring, 1960, to the present. Ninety percent of the original sample are still participating. The study, which was designed to extend over a ten-year period, is still, therefore in progress. Each student has been asked to again take the SVIB, and each will be interviewed at least once more. The information thus gathered during the student's period of residence within the College, together with the cumulative follow-up data, will provide a complete description of the students, including educational experience after leaving the General College; past and present family situation; community activities; leisure time activities; occupational experience; relationships among the student's measured vocational interests at the time of entrance and eight years later; and past and present vocational aspirations. This follow-up study is a major step toward re-emphasizing the research and developmental mission of the General College. It was this ten-year project that provided the basic motivation for undertaking a detailed comparative study of specific student
groups within the overall General College population.

Comparative Studies of College Populations

The literature in the field of business and distributive education reveals very few studies which attempt to compare college students in various programs on the basis of selected background characteristics. Hermsen (1963) made a study to compare students in the business teacher education curriculum with students in other fields of study. The comparisons were made on the basis of background factors, academic achievement factors and persistence factors. Since he found a limited number of studies in which business teacher groups were compared with other groups, his review of the related literature was organized to emphasize the background factors on which his comparisons were made, accentuating the curriculum groups being investigated. His review contains a very extensive and detailed summary of research in the areas of the student's high school record as it related to college achievement, mental abilities scores as related to college academic achievement, and measures related to persistence of college students. Hermsen's study dealt with persistence in terms of whether students remained in college and in the major field originally elected. Data were generated entirely from internal college sources. Questionnaires were not used, nor was any attempt made to follow-up the sample of students after graduation to see if they actually took teaching jobs or jobs related to their majors and to determine the extent to which they remained in occupational fields related to their college majors. The subjects in his study were 867 freshman from Wisconsin State College at Whitewater. The students were compared on the basis of 21 background variables and ten variables relating to academic achievement and persistence while in college. The findings indicated that there were many differences in the
background data of students in various curriculums at Wisconsin State College at Whitewater. Hagen found that certain background factors were much more closely related with later success in college than were others. For the five curriculum groups studied, high school rank was the best predictor of academic achievement as measured by accumulated grade point average. The investigation did reveal that the business teacher education group was significantly different from the other four groups on ten of the 31 variables measured. On the basis of these ten significant differences, it was possible to develop a profile of the business education students.

In a comparative study of distributive education and non-distributive education high school graduates Vogeley (1958) attempted to isolate identifying characteristics differentiating the two groups and to learn whether distributive education graduates were remaining in the field of distribution following their graduation. The study was limited to the 1951 graduates from three public high schools in Erie, Pennsylvania. An initial questionnaire was used which asked for the graduate's course of study and his employment for the five-year period from 1951-1956. From the returns of the initial questionnaire, three groups were selected for further study: a distributive education group composed of 46 persons who had completed two semesters of the merchandising course in high school; a non-distributive education group consisting of 46 persons who did not take the merchandising course in high school, but who were, or had been, in some phase of distribution since graduation; and the control group composed of 46 persons who were not enrolled in the merchandising course and who had never been employed in a full-time distributive occupation since graduation. Data was then collected from these three groups by means of questionnaires sent to the graduates and rating reports sent to the cooperating employers.
Findings included these:

1. There were no outstanding characteristics revealed among the three groups that might be used to identify distributive education students.

2. No statistically significant differences were demonstrated among the three groups on the California Test of Mental Maturity scores.

3. A statistically significant difference was demonstrated between the distributive education and the control groups in grade point averages at graduation with the control group showing the higher average.

4. Employers cooperating with the distributive education work training program generally felt that the distributive education student-trainees were no more outstanding than the non-distributive education student employees.

5. No statistically significant difference was demonstrated among the three groups as to performance of work after graduation.

6. The data showed that the distributive education graduates did not remain in the field of distribution as long as the non-distributive education graduates.

In a comparative study based on an entirely different set of variables, Leister (1965) attempted to discover whether any significant differences exist between health problems of distributive education students and the health problems of general school population. The data were collected by a survey of the student records used by the Dallas schools. It was found that the health problems of the two groups tended to be similar but that the distributive education students, who came from significantly larger families than the non-distributive education students, had more uncorrected physical defects than the general student groups. She recommended that an occupational health unit be included in the distributive education curriculum.
Zancanella (1965) attempted to determine whether or not there were important differences in selected criteria between distributive occupations employees who participated in a secondary school distributive education program and distributive occupations employees who did not participate in such a program during their high school attendance. The population studied consisted of 58 high school distributive education program graduates and 86 non-distributive education graduates from ten cities in Colorado, South Dakota, Nebraska and Wyoming. Questionnaires and job satisfaction blanks were completed by employees and job performance rating scales were completed by employers. Major findings included the following:

1. There were no significant differences between the two groups on job performance rating scales or job satisfaction questionnaires.

2. There were no significant differences between the two groups in the types of firm employing the graduates, in the main job function performed or in salaries.

3. Significantly more of the distributive education group intended to remain in their current type of work than did the non-distributive education group.

4. Most of the distributive education graduates believed that the distributive education program had been of benefit to them in obtaining employment in a distributive occupation.

In a study which will be reported in more detail later in this paper, Pappas (1964) included a comparison of trainees in a post-high school cooperative wholesale management program with employees in similar wholesaling occupations who were not participating in the program. The comparisons were based on relative job performance factors of the two groups.
Studies Related to Post-High Distributive Education Programs

Meyer and Logan (1967) found few studies designed specifically for post-secondary distributive education programs. In an earlier study designed to provide an up-to-date inventory of research completed or underway, Larson (1961) was able to identify only thirteen studies, or less than four percent of the research reported, which was directed toward post-high school programs. Samson (1962) in the Review of Educational Research also commented on the lack of research on post-secondary distributive education.

The Ohio Wholesale Management Development Program provided a springboard for a series of research efforts with promising implications for post-secondary distributive education. The program resulted from the cooperative efforts of Ohio State University, the Vocational Division of the Ohio State Department of Education, the National Association of Manufacturers and the wholesale trade organizations of Ohio. Introduced on an experimental basis in 1961, the plan called for periodic evaluation which resulted in the publication in 1965 of two manuals devoted to post-high school cooperative distributive education programs in the wholesaling field. The first manual is entitled Organizing and Conducting a Program (1965); the second is Curriculum for a Program (1965). These publications are based on actual experiences in the pilot program throughout its first four years in operation.

Pappas (1964) conducted a thorough study of the Ohio program with particular emphasis on the employability of its trainees and their productive effectiveness in the wholesale industry. In comparing cooperative trainees with other employees in similar positions, he found that the trainees progressed much faster in the areas of personal appearance, capacity for growth, quality and quantity of work and human relations, but that the other employees progressed faster than the cooperative trainees in the areas of job
knowledge, product knowledge, customer service and accuracy with figures.

Among other findings were the following: the program attracted trainees of a higher calibre than those normally hired by the wholesalers; and in most cases the wholesalers offered the trainees important jobs following completion of their program. Pappas found that the program was successful in being able to hold the majority of its trainees. He concluded that the Ohio Wholesale Management Program met the objectives expected by both the trainees and the wholesalers.

Also dealing with the Ohio post-secondary experimental wholesaling program, a study by Lucas (1964) was intended to provide profiles of the participating students. He felt that a study of this nature, by better defining the student population the program was serving, would be of benefit to the administrators of the program, the instructional staff and the wholesalers who employed the trainees. His information was from students' cumulative record files and questionnaires sent to both participating students and employers. He found a high degree of correlation between cumulative grade point averages achieved by the trainees, their American College Testing (ACT) scores and their high school percentile ranks. He recommended, however, that, even though ACT scores and high school percentiles were strong indicators of the trainees' potential success in the classroom, these measures should not be the sole criteria for selection. Rather, allowances should be made for possible delayed maturity and increased motivation of certain students. His findings were consistent with those of Pappas in that the majority of the wholesalers considered the trainees to be performing in a manner superior to comparable employees.

Several studies have been made to determine the extent to which distributive education programs are offered on a post-high school level
throughout the United States and to obtain information about curriculum patterns. Two investigators, Martin (1952) and Carver (1960) studied practices in California junior colleges. The purpose of Carver's study was to ascertain the changes in distributive education curriculum patterns in California junior colleges that had occurred between 1938 and 1958. He found that the number of schools offering distributive education increased greatly and that an important element of the development was the increase from single course offerings to major curriculums within business education. Though merchandising had remained the most popular curriculum, real estate and transportation were growing in importance. Martin investigated the practices used by California junior colleges to promote and maintain their merchandising programs. White (1957) conducted a study for the purpose of aiding distributive education instructors and junior college administrators in establishing a junior college program. He surveyed 360 public junior colleges throughout the nation to secure information about curriculums and procedures. Busher (1961) surveyed a sample of community colleges in seven states giving more specific attention to types of degrees or certificates offered, specific courses included and divisions of offerings between general and vocational education. Hoover (1960) undertook a similar project but limited her study to a selected group of junior colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges. She included in her investigation, however, both office and distributive programs. Her findings provided a status report of the cooperative programs in terms of number and types of programs, enrollments, work stations, coordination practices and evaluation procedures.

In an attempt to determine if a need existed for post-high school distributive education training programs in Ohio, Edwards (1960) selected factors which she felt would have a direct bearing on extending distributive
education programs to the 13th and 14th years. The factors included willingness of merchants to cooperate; indication of need; and benefits to be derived from, as well as problems associated with, the development of post-high programs. Her findings, based on interviews with experienced distributive education coordinators and questionnaire returns from merchants, indicated that coordinators thought there would be fewer problems in developing vocational interest in post-high than in high school students and that a distributive education program should be offered as a separate post-high graduate course rather than as a continuation of present high school programs. Coordinators felt, however, that high school was still the best place to offer distributive education because too many students could not be reached otherwise. Merchants, for the most part, indicated a need for post-high school specialized training for distributive occupations and, generally, said that they would cooperate in developing and maintaining programs. Edwards noted that post-high programs provide a higher level of job placement than do high school programs.

In one of the very few studies conducted on a post-high school level to attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of a program in preparing its graduates for careers in distribution, Corbman (1958) surveyed graduates of the Retail Distribution Department of the New York Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences. Questionnaires which were mailed to all graduates of the period from 1947 to 1953 inquired about the frequency with which the graduates engaged in retailing activities related to material taught in the curriculum. In general Corbman's findings were that those competencies, information and attitudes stressed in the retailing curriculum were sufficiently necessary and useful for the performance of the graduates' retailing duties to warrant retention of that training in the curriculum.
Other Related Studies

Two studies related to distributive education which used measures of job satisfaction were reviewed. One of these was a study by Coffey (1949), a purpose of which was to examine the characteristics of workers in non-selling jobs in retail stores. Job satisfaction was measured through the use of the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Scale. Coffey concluded that the job satisfaction scale had little real validity when used on an occupationally immature sample. Robertson (1965) attempted to appraise the effect of the cooperative education program in the secondary school on beginning workers, using selected factors which were related to job success and satisfaction. He found that cooperative education did not appear to have any effect on job satisfaction or job performance.

A number of follow-up studies have been undertaken in an attempt to determine the effects of cooperative distributive education training on later job experience. Few follow-up studies, however, have attempted to compare experiences of former distributive education students with those of non-distributive education students. The studies by Zancanella (1965) and Vogeley (1958), both reported on earlier in this review, did make some comparisons of this nature on high school populations. Mason (1962), as part of a study to determine whether the content and structure of related instruction in Illinois high school distributive education programs reach beyond preparation for and success in the entry job, gathered information from both distributive education and non-distributive education graduates. He found that growth and advancement on the job as a result of training was not pronounced when comparing the distributive education graduates and the non-distributive education graduates. Employer opinion, however, gave stronger indication of growth and advancement for the distributive education graduates.
Note: All of the studies discussed on the preceding pages are listed in the following bibliography. The bibliography itself is a selected one: every item is relevant to a study comparing students enrolled in a two-year marketing program with students enrolled in a more general curriculum in the General College of the University of Minnesota. A full review and annotation of the literature in the broad field of distributive education is provided by Meyer and Logan (1967).
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