

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO COPY

In presenting this paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this paper for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication of this paper for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature

Ronald James Miller

Date

May 16, 1980

A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF EXPANDING
PROGRAMS OF SECONDARY VOCATIONAL BUSINESS
AND OFFICE EDUCATION IN MONTANA

BY

RONALD JAMES MILLER

A professional paper submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Business Education

Approved:


Chairperson, Graduate Committee


Head, Major Department


Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

May, 1980

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the members of his graduate committee: Dr. Norm Millikin, Dr. Floyd Frost, and Dr. DeForest Rall. A special note of appreciation is expressed to Dr. Daniel Hertz for his many suggestions and incentives toward the completion of this paper. Gratitude is also expressed to fellow graduate students and to Marion Reed, State Consultant for Business and Office Education, for their assistance in the preparation and administration of the survey instrument.

The writer also gives recognition to those State Supervisors of Business and Office Education that responded to the study, without whose responses this study would have been impossible.

Special thanks goes to the writer's wife, Betzy, and his children, Brenda, Kimberly, and Patrick, for their thoughtfulness and patience during the preparation of this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Need for the Study	4
Limitations	5
Definition of Terms	5
Organization of the Study	7
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
A Historical Review of Federal Legislation	8
Major Economic Issues of Vocational Education	12
Sources for Increasing Funding of Vocational Education	14
Analysis of the Business Education Curriculum	16
Summary	19
3. PROCEDURES	21
Sources of Data and Determination of Population Size	22
Construction of the Survey Instrument	22
Administration of the Survey Instrument	23
Analysis of the Data	24
4. FINDINGS	26
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
Summary	51
Summary of Review Literature	52
Conclusions	53
Recommendations	54
 APPENDIXES	
A. Letter of Transmittal	58
B. Survey Instrument	59
C. Follow-up Letter	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY	62

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Number and Percentage of Returns of the Survey Instrument	24
2. Federal Vocational Education Funds Allocated to Secondary Vocational Education	27
3. State Funding for Vocational Education	29
4. State Funding Allocated to Secondary Vocational Business and Office Education	30
5. Prevocational Course Funding Provision Within State Plan	31
6. Funding for Prevocational Business and Office Education Courses	32
7. Basis for Funding Secondary Vocational Business and Office Education	33
8. Funded Program Clusters in 25 States	34
9. Courses Funded Within the Accounting Cluster (21 states)	35
10. Courses Funded Within the Data Processing Cluster (22 states)	37
11. Courses Funded Within the General Clerical Cluster (25 states)	38
12. Courses Funded Within the Steno/Secretarial Cluster (25 states)	40
13. Courses Funded on Basis of Specific Courses (19 states)	42
14. Methods of Soliciting Assistance From Business Educators in Determining the Funding Formula	46

Table	<u>Page</u>
15. Adequacy of Funding for Vocational Business and Office Education in Relation to Funding for All Other Secondary Vocational Education Programs	48
16. Comprehensive Guideline for Vocational Business and Office Education	49

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to provide information that would determine the feasibility of expanding programs of secondary vocational business and office education in Montana. The basis of the study was a comparison of the State Plan for Vocational Education in each of the 50 responding states.

The survey instrument was mailed to the State Supervisor for Business and Office Education in each of the 50 states. Thirty-six instruments were returned and all of the returns were considered useable. The replies were tabulated and analyzed.

The findings of the study showed that a large majority of the states allocated a percentage of the federal funds received and intended for vocational education to secondary vocational education programs. A large majority of the state legislatures appropriated funds, in addition to federal funds received, for secondary vocational education. The majority of the reported allocations of state appropriated funds to business and office education programs ranged from 10 to 19 percent. The lowest reported allocation, 10.3 percent, was in Montana.

The most desired basis for funding secondary vocational business and office education was shown to be program "clusters". All of the states that used program clusters as the basis for funding allowed funding for the General Clerical and Steno/Secretarial clusters and almost all of the states allowed funding for the Accounting and Data Processing clusters. A provision for funding prevocational courses was, however, not a common element of the State Plans for Vocational Education, and where this provision was found, it was generally for only industrial arts.

The most important criteria used in the funding formula to determine allocations of funds to Local Education Association's (LEA's) was shown to be (1) relative ability of LEA to provide resources, (2) relative number or concentration of low income families or individuals, (3) relative number of unemployed in the area served by the LEA, (4) assessed valuation per average daily membership for the LEA, and (5) number of full-time equivalent students enrolled in vocational education.

Most of the State Supervisors for Business and Office Education felt that the funding for secondary vocational business and office education, in relation to funding for all other secondary vocational education programs, was inadequate and improvement was needed.

Most of the states have a Comprehensive Guideline for Business and Office Education, but in some states it has not been updated for several years.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

More and more, citizens in the United States are coming to the realization that it is not only wise educational policy but also wise economic policy to prepare every youth and adult for a job. The economic burdens and the social costs of unemployment are becoming staggering problems. If we can teach the individual how to work and provide him with employable skills, knowledges, habits and attitudes in keeping with the needs of employers, the costs of welfare and institutional care will soon be diminished (Larson, 1971, 55).

Today, millions of jobs are unfilled due to the lack of qualified workers, while at the same time millions of people are unemployed. Therefore, money invested in vocational education will reap great rewards, but the amount presently available is totally inadequate to achieve the goals sought (Larson, 1971, 56).

The general population must understand that investment in vocational education brings a higher rate of return than that of any other competitive industry. The argument that we are underinvesting in education as a whole and grossly underinvesting in vocational education is irresistible. In addition, state legislatures and local taxing authorities are often "cold" to the needs of vocational education.

More and more types of programs must be made available to more individuals (Larson, 1971). Availability of quality vocational education programs in more vocational fields for more individuals is a crying need today.

Business Education serves all students as a part of general education with such courses as General Business, Business Law or Economics. Business and office education also provides specialized vocational programs for those who seek employment in business and office occupations through "cluster areas" of preparation and training. The 1979 Annual Plan for Vocational Education in Montana makes constant reference to funding of vocational programs, but allows funding for only what are termed the "capstone courses" of the business and office education curriculum.

Office education is an area of major concentration in business education. It is important to keep students up-to-date in this area because large numbers of students will be directly involved in the office occupations. According to the U.S. Department of Labor (1976), more than 16 million clerical or office workers will be needed between 1974 and 1985, based on growth and replacement--the percentage of increase in employment during that period being over 30 percent. Also, the changing nature and functions of office work emphasize the need for continuing education for students training in this field. Since the office function in business is expanding, school districts need to

emphasize office skills courses.

The office education curriculum at Birmingham, Michigan, is representative of curriculums that have been reviewed in business education literature recently. This program will prepare office education majors for a variety of office positions and at the same time be able to adapt to changing business demands (NBEA, 1977). Most educators recognize the desirability of providing suggested sequences of courses to be included in the office education programs.

This study, therefore, was designed to gather information that would determine (1) the need for broadening the scope of secondary business and office education programs in the State of Montana and (2) the feasibility of increasing state funding for expanded secondary vocational business and office programs in the State of Montana.

Statement of the Problem

The current plan for funding of vocational business education programs in Montana includes only those courses that are considered as "capstone courses"--secretarial office practice and co-op, simulated model office and co-op, and clerical office practice and co-op. Competencies needed for complete vocational training in clerical and secretarial programs include other courses such as typewriting, shorthand, accounting, data processing, office machines, or business communications, some of which are prerequisites to the so called "capstone courses". Many states also offer vocational

programs designed to provide competencies for entry-level employment in the accounting and data processing field.

This study was designed to:

- (1) identify what other states consider as program offerings for vocational funding within their secondary business and office education curriculums;
- (2) provide information that would determine the feasibility of funding all courses within a defined General Clerical and Steno/Secretarial vocational program in Montana;
- (3) provide information that would determine the feasibility of funding defined Accounting and Data Processing vocational programs in Montana.

Need for the Study

Historically, business education has not received the same financial support for vocational programs as have the other areas of the secondary school curriculums. Although there has been constant effort by many Montana business and office educators and state leaders to increase the state funding for business and office education, there is no evidence of any previous study to determine the feasibility of increasing the state funding for such expanded programs.

Within the categorical funding policy for the State of Montana for 1979, (OPI, 1978), the only reference to "capstone courses" is in the business and office education curriculum. All others--agriculture,

distributive education, home economics, trade and industrial and health--make reference to specific "programs" of instruction. The state criteria used for determining approval of funds thus appears to show a lack of uniformity in its efforts to fund secondary vocational education.

This study was therefore deemed important to those state business education leaders that make their constant appeals to increase the funding for business and office education programs.

Limitations

This study was limited to a determination of

- (1) the need for broadening the scope of secondary vocational business and office education programs in Montana and
- (2) the feasibility of increasing state funding for secondary vocational business and office educational programs in the State of Montana.

Definition of Terms

Business education. A part of the secondary school curriculum which serves a dual role to contribute to the general business and economic understanding of all students as well as providing vocational business training for secretarial, clerical, accounting or data processing entry-level positions.

Business education leaders. This term applies to those individuals recognized as playing important roles in the development of business education, either through contribution to research, literature, teaching business education courses, or as officers of national or state organizations or agencies concerned with the improvement of business and office education.

Capstone course. A planned course which "tops off" a series of instructional courses within a defined program of instruction.

Cluster vocational programs. Programs which are based on the concept that occupations may be classified into logically related groups on the basis of identical or similar elements or characteristics.

Curriculum. As it is used in this study, the word curriculum is limited to the office education area of business education and consists of all those experiences intended for students training for the office occupations.

General education. That part of a students education that is generally accepted as being needed by all students.

Prevocational courses. Courses which prepare individuals to enter a more advanced vocational program or which leads to more

advanced vocational study.

Vocational cooperative office education (co-op). As it is used in this study, the term co-op defines a program in which students, along with classroom study, are placed in on-the-job training positions for part of the school day.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 establishes the nature of the problem of this study which has dealt with the feasibility of increasing state funding for expanded secondary business and office education vocational programs in the State of Montana.

Chapter 2 describes a review of current literature in the field of vocational education along with pertinent information derived from various secondary vocational business education instructors and state vocational directors within the State of Montana.

Chapter 3 summarizes the procedures used in carrying out this study.

Chapter 4 considers the findings concerning the funding for secondary vocational business education programs in other states.

Chapter 5 summarizes the responses to the study, states conclusions on the basis of the findings of the study and considers recommendations on the basis of the conclusions reached.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The vocational education funding policies for states is in an ongoing process of change. Because of this constant change, documented material in relation to funding of specific vocational education programs has been and most likely will continue to be, virtually non-existent. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter was to review literature that was related to vocational education funding in the following ways:

- (1) a historical review of federal legislation regarding vocational education funding for business and office education,
- (2) major economic issues of vocational education,
- (3) a statement of possible sources for increasing vocational education funding of state programs and
- (4) an analysis of business education curriculum content aimed at a core curriculum for vocational business and office education programs.

In addition to a review in the above areas, a review of specific state plans was also undertaken. The results of this review are cited in the data of Chapter 4.

A Historical Review of Federal Legislation

Vocational education has been a significant part of the program

of instruction in the American public schools for more than 60 years. Not only has it grown in the number of people it serves, but also in the occupations for which it prepares. The expenditures have increased from \$5 million in 1920 to over \$5 billion in 1978 (AVA, 1979). However, as Swanson (1971) indicated, in spite of massive growth and development there is still no uniform definition of vocational education, services vary widely and the use of educational services is often neither efficient nor effective.

December 13, 1963, marked an important milestone in the history of business education. It was on this date that the Congress of the United States passed the Vocational Education Act which for the first time recognized vocational business education as being eligible for federal assistance for the purpose of maintaining, extending and improving vocational business education.

This Act, however, merely authorized Congress to appropriate federal funds. The provisions of the Act left it entirely to the states to decide which fields of vocational education should be funded. As noted by the Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education in 1964 (NBEA, 1970), and is still a vital issue today, unless the business educators of a state take action to promote business education, it is possible that vocational funding for business and office education may be overlooked entirely or given only token assistance.

An important aspect of the Vocational Education Act of 1963

(Calhoun, 1976) indicated that after July 1, 1964, in order for states to be eligible for federal assistance, all federal funds allotted to a state for vocational education must be matched on a fifty-fifty basis by the state.

The development and passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 gave a new direction toward vocational education funding. The purpose of these Amendments was to provide relevant services to all individuals; occupational fields were intentionally eliminated as a basis of funding. It further established the limit of the matching requirement as specified in the Vocational Education Act of 1963 by specifying that no local school district would be denied access to federal vocational funds due to lack of matching funds.

Congress added several new clauses to its declaration of purpose in the Vocational Amendments of 1976. One major purpose for the authorization of funds under the new amendments was to insure that states improve their planning by involving a wide range of interested agencies and individuals. These new amendments also reaffirmed the 1963 Act and 1968 Amendments; namely to authorize funds to assist states to extend, improve, and where necessary to maintain existing programs of vocational education.

Although the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was the first to require states to develop long-range program plans, a requirement that was also emphasized by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, it

was the 1976 Amendments that made it necessary to have annual state plans approved in order to be eligible for federal fundings of vocational education programs.

Everyone involved in the program planning for vocational education should be thoroughly familiar with the basic principles of vocational education (Calhoun, 1976).

1. Vocational education is a national concern.
2. Vocational education provides for the common defense and promotes the general welfare.
3. Vocational preparation of youth and adults is a public school responsibility.
4. Vocational education requires a sound basic education.
5. Vocational education is planned and conducted in close cooperation with business and industry.
6. Vocational education provides skills and knowledges valuable in the labor market.
7. Vocational education provides continuing education for youth and adults.

In regard to these principles, Barlow (1975) says:

The majority of the principles that guide vocational education today were first delineated during the period of 1906 through 1917, and have been periodically reinterpreted to reflect changes in society, business, industry and education. Principles that were first expressed as beliefs or theories have since 1917 been verified and are now considered as standards or basic truths.

These principles served as the foundation upon which the Vocational Education Act of 1917 (Smith-Hughes Act) was developed and enacted by Congress. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P.L. 88-210) and the Educational Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-976) and 1976 (P.L. 94-482) have continued to serve this function by giving the states more flexibility in planning their vocational programs.

Major Economic Issues of Vocational Education

There are two basic questions that underlie much of the research on the economics of education. The first question is how much more or how much less should be invested in education in general, and the second is how much more or how much less should be invested in specific types of education (Hansen, 1967). Both issues are of concern to vocational education, but particularly the second issue which has direct implications for vocational education.

Vocational education has constantly been faced with economic problems and issues that stem from a variety of sources. Some citizens feel that vocational education is a poor investment of public funds and assert their opinions at legislative assemblies, during public meetings and at the polls (Hopkins, 1979, 53). These individuals may not be knowledgeable about vocational education or they may not realize that the nation requires a well-trained work force and that most persons must be educated to obtain a job and to maintain a standard of living.

One of the most formidable problems faced by vocational education decision makers is the difficulty of obtaining adequate funds. There are limits to the amount of funds available for education. The demand for funds is virtually unlimited; consequently, the allocation of funds to both general education and vocational education have become critical issues.

Vocational education has been characterized historically by a scarcity of funds and an abundance of needs--a typical economic phenomenon. Conclusions from research on the economics of vocational education reveal the following:

- (1) additional public funds should be spent on the vocational curricula of secondary schools rather than on the non-vocational curricula of secondary schools;
- (2) the return to investment in vocational education has shown to be considerably greater than the return in investment in alternative curricula;
- (3) vocational education is an economically worthwhile investment for individuals and society (Kaufman, et. al., 1968).

Research has shown consistently a favorable relationship between an individual's educational attainment, subsequent income and prospects for employment (Weisbrod, 1966b; Levin et. al., 1971). The basic idea relating investment in vocational education to economic

growth is that vocational education has positive effects on the development of human talent, which in turn, has positive effects on economic growth (Kraft, 1968).

Therefore, vocational education, by contributing to worker productivity, is a process of investing human capital (Weisbrod, 1966b). Schultz (1963, 1967) stated that investment in schooling is a major source of human capital.

Society has imposed on vocational education yet another responsibility for helping solve one of its critical social problems--training of the disadvantaged. Although this is a worthy service, it is unusually costly and imposes an additional demand on available funds.

The economic benefits to be gained from vocational education are many. With approximately 80 percent of the nation's work force employed in jobs requiring less than a professional degree (Hopkins, 1977, 153) it becomes increasingly important for educational institutions to provide opportunities for individuals to receive vocational training.

Sources for Increasing Funding of Vocational Education

Vocational and technical education is more costly than most other educational programs offered by our schools, and someone must pay for the additional costs. Vocational education usually requires more space than other types of education, especially if the particular

program utilizes a shop or laboratory. The equipment used is more specialized and usually more expensive than that used in general education. These factors become restrictions for many decision makers, particularly when considering the offering of new or expanded programs.

Wide variations in methods of financing local education programs cause real problems. Many local education agencies would like to offer a larger variety of vocational programs to give students more training options, but the financial base of the school district does not permit this to happen. Largely for this reason, the financing of vocational education has become a joint endeavor of local education agencies, the state and the federal government. Moreover, this joint funding endeavor must continue to provide the needed occupational training. If local school districts are serious about meeting the population and manpower needs of their communities, increased emphasis must be placed on vocational education (Hopkins, 1977, 157).

As this increased emphasis becomes reality, state governments must participate in financing vocational education to a larger extent. There seems to be general agreement that the federal government should continue to increase funding for national priority programs and for persons with special needs for vocational education, and that it should assist in offsetting the increased cost of training (Hopkins, 1977, 157).

Another possible source of increasing vocational training funds is for employers to help finance training programs that are geared to a specific type of work (Hopkins, 1977, 157). For example, where training programs are designed to upgrade productivity within a particular business or industry, perhaps those enterprises which benefit from the training should contribute to its cost.

It also seems reasonable that individuals whose skills are being updated or upgraded could take part in financing their training (Hopkins, 1977, 157). Once local, state and federal governments have furnished preparatory occupational training, and those who have completed the training are placed in relevant jobs, then those who wished further training in their field might contribute toward the cost of that training. Such individual inputs would be a small part of the total cost of training.

Analysis of the Business Education Curriculum

Business and office education makes a significant impact on the nation's economy through the preparation of office workers for entry into the labor force. The responsibility of business educators and leaders for providing appropriate training for a myriad of jobs in the office careers is a formidable one (Garrison, 1977, 277).

An indication of the significance of the business and office education area can be seen from the number of workers in the labor

force. The Occupational Outlook Handbook (U.S. Department of Labor, 1976) identifies office occupations as one of the 15 "career clusters" and refers to participants as office workers. In 1974, these workers numbered 15 million and constituted the largest occupational group listed in the handbook (U.S. Department of Labor, 1976).

In the pronouncement "This We Believe About Business Education in the Secondary School", the Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education (1970), which is composed of outstanding authorities in the field of business, state that business education is concerned with two major aspects of the education of youth:

- (1) the knowledge, attitudes and nonvocational skills needed by all persons to be effective in their personal economics and in their understanding of our economic system, and
- (2) the vocational knowledge and skills needed for initial employment and for advancement in a business career.

The preparation of youth to succeed in the world of work should be an important objective of the American high school. As our economy expands, the demand for youth prepared for business and office occupations will continue to increase. Relative to business and office vocational education, the Policies Commission (1970) further states that

- (1) the high school curriculum should include sequences of courses that adequately prepare youth for initial

employment in business, and

- (2) vocational business subjects should be so placed in the high school curriculum that the student will achieve maximum vocational competencies closest to the time of graduation.

There have been efforts to make the business education curricula more vocationally oriented, but in many schools there are limited vocational programs, and for the most part the curriculum has been course and subject oriented (Kaufman, 1975). What seems to be lacking is the emphasis on occupational competencies and skills necessary for entry-level employment. Often times students may not be aware they are indeed enrolled in a program specifically designed for a specific occupational area.

Vocational education programs should be structured to help students develop the skills, attitudes and knowledge needed for either entry-level employment in a "family" of related occupations (clusters) or for other post-secondary alternatives (Oregon, 1975). Cluster vocational programs are based on the concept that occupations may be classified into logically related groups on the basis of identical or similar elements or characteristics. The curriculum of these cluster type vocational programs are structured around common competencies.

Certain occupational clusters can be identified within the office occupations career curricula--accounting, data processing,

office practice, and steno/secretarial--as shown in a study by Connover and Daggett (1976). These areas should correlate very closely with educational programs or curriculum patterns in business and office education.

Each cluster area should be established on the basis of tasks performed on the job and the competencies needed to enter the labor market in that area. Greater emphasis should be placed on the competencies needed to be successful on the job rather than on the number of courses taken.

Summary

The history of vocational education within America's public school system is relatively brief. It has been little more than 60 years since the first federal act to support vocational education was passed by Congress. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 created a federal-state-local partnership whereby the schools have become an institution in our society for preparing students and adults for employment.

If business and industry require a trained work force, the investment in vocational education is a sound one. Not only are the people who go through vocational training employed, but the money that they return to society in the form of taxes is increasingly significant. A study by the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education (1974) showed that the cost of occupational training was returned within two or three years.

Vocational education, including that for the office occupations, has experienced rapid growth, especially since the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. During fiscal year 1975, approximately 60 percent of those individuals enrolled in office occupations programs were at the secondary school level; 18 percent, post-secondary; and 22 percent, adult (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1975).

The significance of the office occupations is further manifested when a comparison is made between the growth and rank of office occupations OE instructional programs and those of other programs with large enrollments. In a report by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1974), it was noted that of the twelve top ranking programs, five of the twelve--the 2nd, Typing and Related; 3rd, Steno/Secretarial; 5th, Filing and Office Machines; 6th, Accounting and Computing; and 11th, Data Processing--were office occupations programs.

Although reliable cost information, either direct or indirect, is not available concerning education for the office occupations, a reasonable assumption would be that the investment in business and office education has a significant effect on the contribution to personal earnings or national income (Garrison, 1977, 286).

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES

This study was designed to provide information that would determine the feasibility of expanding programs of secondary vocational business and office education in Montana. The basis of the study was a comparison of the State Plans for Vocational Education in each of the responding 50 states. As a result of such comparison, the basis presently considered for funding secondary vocational business and office education programs was identified. This was further enhanced by an identification of those specific courses within a program cluster that were funded. Also identified were any prevocational business and office education courses that were presently being funded in specific states.

This study was designed to identify funding formulas or criteria used in determining allocation of funds for secondary vocational education. The percentage of total federal funds received and intended for vocational education that were allocated to secondary vocational programs and the percent allocated to business and office education were identified. The states were then ranked accordingly. Also identified were the number of state legislatures that provide additional funds for secondary vocational education and the percentage of those funds that were allocated to secondary vocational business and office education programs.

The purposes of this chapter were to:

- (1) describe the sources of the data and the determination of the population size,
- (2) explain the construction of the survey instrument,
- (3) describe the administration of the survey instrument, and
- (4) describe the methods of analyzing the data.

Sources of Data and Determination of Population Size

The statistical data were obtained by a survey of the state Superivisors for Business and Office Education for each of the 50 states. It was determined that this population size would be appropriate for the acquisition of desired statistical data.

A "Directory of State Officials with Supervisory Responsibility for Business and Office Occupations Education", compiled by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and dated January, 1980, was utilized to obtain names and addresses of State Supervisors for the population sample. This directory was acquired through the Montana Office of Public Instruction.

Construction of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument used in conducting this survey is found in Appendix B. Issues presented in the Review of Literature, Chapter 2, provided the basis for the development of questions considered for the questionnaire.

A rough draft of the questionnaire was submitted in February, 1980, to the members of the investigator's graduate committee at Montana State University--Dr. Norm Millikin, Dr. Floyd Frost, and Dr. DeForest Rall--for preliminary review.

After necessary revisions, the questionnaire was finalized. Questions were structured so as to receive as much information as possible with a minimum of time commitment on the part of the respondent.

The questionnaire was then submitted to the graduate research class, BUED 522, for suggestions and advice. Suggestions were also provided by Marion Reed, State Consultant for Business and Office Education in Montana. A revised draft was presented to the investigator's faculty advisor in March, 1980, and the survey instrument was determined appropriate.

Administration of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument and letter of transmittal (Appendix A) were printed during the month of March, 1980.

On March 10, 1980, the first mailing was sent to the State Supervisor for Business and Office Education in each of the 50 states. The suggested return date for the questionnaire was March 20. By that date, 28 of the state supervisors had responded. This represented 56 percent of the state supervisors asked to participate in the study.

A second mailing (Appendix C) was sent on March 29, 1980. By April 20, 36 responses, or 72% had been received.

The investigator's graduate committee determined that the number of questionnaires received from the two mailings were adequate to provide sufficient data for the study and follow-up efforts were discontinued.

All returns were considered to be useable.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of the number of questionnaires sent to State Supervisors for Business and Office Education and the percentages of returns received.

Table 1

Number of Percentage of Returns
of the Survey Instrument

Questionnaires Sent	50
Questionnaires Received	36
Percentage of Returns	72%

Analysis of the Data

Responses from each of the 36 returns were tabulated on work sheets in order to summarize the data.

Tables were constructed from the work sheets in order to present

the findings in a readable and understandable form. The statistics given in these tables related to the number of responses to each question and how those responses compared as a percentage of the total responses for that table.

Because of the nature of question 5, a table was considered inappropriate. Therefore, a written narrative was used for summary purposes.

The tables, explanations, and narrative are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

This chapter presents a tabulation and analysis of the data obtained from the survey of State Supervisors for Business and Office Education in each of the 50 states. As shown in Table 1, page 24, the statistical data presented in this chapter is represented by the returns of 36, or 72 percent, of the 50 states. Each of the returns received was considered useable.

Tables 2 through 16 appear in this chapter. Each question from the questionnaire is presented in a table or tables indicating the statistical information gathered by the investigator. Also, the statistical data from each table is analyzed and interpreted. Because of the nature of question 5 of the questionnaire, a table was considered inappropriate and a written narrative was used for summary purposes.

In order to define terms used, clarify a program offering, or to add emphasis to an answer, several respondents provided written comments. Thus, several direct quotes have been included where appropriate.

Question 1: What percent of federal funds intended for vocational education received by your state are allocated to secondary vocational education programs?

Table 2

Federal Vocational Education Funds Allocated
to Secondary Vocational Education

State	%	State	%
Massachussetts	85	Arkansas	45
Virginia	85	Hawaii	42
Kentucky	80	Indiana	40
Texas	80	Wisconsin	40
Ohio	75	North Dakota	37
West Virginia	73	Washington	37
Nevada	72	Illinois	32.5 ^a
Arizona	68	Oregon	32
North Carolina	67	South Carolina	30
New Hampshire	65	South Dakota	28
Nebraska	61	Alaska	25
Maryland	60	Alabama	20
New York	55	Maine	4 ^b
California	54	New Mexico	0 ^b
Florida	50	Montana	0 ^b
Georgia	50	Idaho	0 ^c
Utah	50	Kansas	0 ^c
Connecticut	48	Tennessee	0 ^c

^aOne-half of total Federal/State allocation.

^bAll federal funds received allocated to post-secondary.

^cPercent unknown or unavailable.

Table 2 above shows that states consider federal funds to be

a very important source of funding for secondary vocational education programs. Thirty-four, or 94 percent, of the 36 responding states used federal funds as a source of support for secondary vocational education programs. Three of the responding states indicated that the percent of federal funds allocated to secondary vocational education programs was either unknown or unavailable.

Two of the responding states allocated the maximum of 85 percent allowed by federal legislation. Twenty, or 55.6 percent, of the 36 responding states allocated one-half or more of the maximum percent of federal funds allowed for secondary vocational education programs.

Only 2, or 5.6 percent, of the 36 responding states, of which Montana is one, did not allocate federal funds to secondary vocational education programs. Both respondents indicated that all federal funds received and intended for vocational education were allocated to post-secondary vocational education.

Question 2: In addition to federal funds received for vocational education, does your state legislature provide funds for secondary vocational education?

Table 3

State Funding for Vocational Education

Response	No.	%
Yes	30	83.3
No	6	16.7
Total	36	100.0

The majority of the state legislatures of the responding states showed support for secondary vocational education through the appropriation of state funds. Thirty, or 83.3 percent, of the 36 responding states, reported that the state legislature did provide funds, in addition to federal funds, for secondary vocational education. Only 6, or 16.7 percent, of the 36 responding states did not receive state appropriated funds for secondary vocational education programs.

Question 2A: What percent of the total state appropriated funds for secondary vocational education are presently allocated to secondary vocational business and office education?

Table 4

State Funding Allocated to Secondary Vocational
Business and Office Education

Range/%	No.	%
0	0	0
1-9	0	0
10-19	8	53.3
20-29	2	13.3
30-39 ^a	3	20.0
40-49	1	6.7
50-59	0	0
60-69	0	0
70-79	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

^a32.5% used = $\frac{1}{2}$ of total Federal/State allocation.

The most frequently reported percent of total state appropriated funds for secondary vocational education allocated to business and office education was from 10 to 19 percent.

Of the 15 states that reported an allocation of state funds to secondary vocational business and office education, the lowest, 10.3 percent, was in Montana. The average of the 15 reported allocations of state funds for business and office education was 25.2 percent.

Seven, or 19.4 percent, of the 30 states that reported state appropriated funding for secondary vocational education indicated the percent allocated to business and office education was unavailable.

One respondent commented, "Funds are allocated to secondary school districts. They decide which program gets the funds." Another respondent commented, "Funding is based on student contact hours." Eight, or 26.7 percent, gave no response.

Question 3: Does your present State Plan for Vocational Education contain a provision for funding prevocational courses?

Table 5

Prevocational Course Funding Provision Within State Plan

Response	No.	%
Yes	16	44.4
No	20	55.6
Total	36	100.0

As shown in Table 5 above, the majority of the responding states reported that a provision for funding prevocational courses was not a part of the State Plan for Vocational Education. Sixteen, or 44.4 percent, of the 36 responding states did have a provision for funding prevocational courses.

Question 3A: Are any prevocational business and office education courses presently being funded?

Table 6

Funding for Prevocational Business
and Office Education Courses

Response	No.	%
Yes	8	50.0
No	8	50.0
Total	16	100.0

Of the 16 states that did indicate a provision for funding prevocational courses, 8 reported that there was no provision for funding any prevocational business and office education courses. Five states indicated that industrial arts was the only prevocational course that was funded.

Eight of the states did provide funding for prevocational business and office education. One state reported that prevocational courses were funded only with state appropriated funds.

The most frequently cited course title was "exploration of BOE" or "orientation to BOE". One state reported the funding of an 18-week course for 8th grade students entitled "business exploration". Another state reported the funding of typing I, introduction to business, and general business if they were part of a four-year vocational program.

Question 4: On what basis does your present State Plan for Vocational Education allow funding for secondary vocational business and office education?

Table 7

Basis for Funding Secondary Vocational
Business and Office Education

Basis	No.	%
Program "clusters"	15	41.7
Specific courses	9	25.0
Both	10	27.8
No Response	2	5.5
Total	36	100.0

The most frequently reported basis for funding of vocational business and office education was by program "clusters". As shown in Table 7 above, only 9, or 25 percent, of the 36 responding states reported funding on the basis of specific courses. Ten, or 27.8 percent, of the 26 responding states used a combination of both program "clusters" and specific courses as the basis for funding secondary vocational business and office education.

One state that used program "clusters" as the basis for funding defined a program as being from 3 to 4½ hours a day for 2 years.

Of the 2 states that did not give a response as to the basis used, one commented that the "total BOE program" was funded. The other commented that programs only were funded according to the 6 digit, 14.00 USOE codes.

Question 4A: Which of the following program clusters are funded?

Table 8
Funded Program Clusters
in 25 States

Program "cluster"	No.	%
Accounting	21	84.0
Data Processing	22	88.0
General Clerical	25	100.0
Steno/Secretarial	25	100.0
Other	12	47.8

Table 8 above shows that the General Clerical and Steno/Secretarial clusters were funded by all of the 25 states that use program "clusters" either alone or in combination with specific courses. The Accounting and Data Processing clusters were also funded by a large majority of the states.

Twelve, or 48 percent, of the 25 states that allowed funding on

the basis of program "clusters" cited funding of additional program "clusters". Titles of other program "clusters" that were noted included Business Administration, Accounting/Data Processing, Computer Operations (including Data Processing), Senior Intensified, Key punch, Reprographics, Medical Office Procedures, Legal Office Procedures, Supervisory Management, Information-Communications, and Typing and Related.

One state indicated the Accounting cluster was funded by the title of Business Management and one state indicated that the Data Processing cluster was funded by the title of Computer Operations. Two states indicated the General Clerical cluster was funded by the title of Clerk Typist.

Question 4B: Check any of the following courses that are funded within each cluster.

Table 9
Courses Funded Within the Accounting Cluster
(21 states)

Course	No.	%	Course	No.	%
Gen. Business ^a	4	19.0	Bus. Law	7	33.4
Accounting I	13	62.0	Coop. Off. Educ.	16	76.2
Accounting II	14	66.7	Other		
Bus./Off. Machines	13	62.0	Office Procedures	3	14.3

Table 9--Continued

Course	No.	%	Course	No.	%
Bus. Machines	6	28.6	Recordkeeping	1	4.8
Bus. Communications	6	28.6	IOL ^b -Accounting	1	4.8
Data Proc. I (Sem)	11	52.4	Model Office	2	9.5
Data Proc. II (Sem)	9	42.9	Bus. Specialization	1	4.8
Typing I (Sem) ^a	8	38.1	Bus. Org. & Mgmt.	1	4.8
Typing II (Sem) ^a	8	38.1	Bus. Economics	1	4.8
Typing III (Sem)	11	52.4	Recordkeeping II	1	4.8
Typing IV (Sem)	11	52.4	Cler. Acct. I & II ^c	1	4.8

^aRequired but not funded (Virginia)

^bIntensified Office Laboratory

^cTwo hours/day for 2 years

Table 9 above shows a general pattern of courses funded within the Accounting cluster with those most closely related to entry-level employment--accounting I, accounting II, bus./off. machines--and the related cooperative office education class being most predominant. One semester of data processing and a second year of typewriting were also shown to be important in the Accounting cluster.

Of the nine additional courses that were listed, only office

procedures, which was indicated by 3 states, showed any significance for funding within the Accounting cluster.

Three of the 21 states that indicated funding for the Accounting cluster did not specify the courses that were funded.

Table 10
Courses Funded Within the Data Processing Cluster
(22 states)

Course	No.	%	Course	No.	%
Gen. Business ^a	4	18.2	Bus. Math	4	18.2
Data Proc. I (Sem)	14	63.6	Coop. Off. Educ.	16	72.7
Data Proc. II (Sem)	15	68.2	Other		
Accounting I	11	50.0	IOL ^b -Data Proc.	1	4.5
Accounting II	11	50.0	Intro. to Programming	1	4.5
Bus. Law	5	22.8	Off. Procedures	1	4.5
Bus./Off. Machines	10	45.4	Economics	1	4.5
Bus. Communications	4	18.2	Data Proc. I (Yr.)	1	4.5
Typing I (Sem) ^a	8	36.4	Data Proc. II (Yr.)	1	4.5
Typing II (Sem) ^a	9	40.9	Data Proc. I & II ^c	1	4.5
Typing III (Sem)	9	40.9	Model Office	1	4.5
Typing IV (Sem)	9	40.9	Computer Operations	1	4.5

^aRequired but not funded (Virginia)

^bIntensified Office Laboratory

^cTwo hours/day for 2 years

The funding of those courses most closely related to entry-level employment--data processing I & II--and the related cooperative office education were the most predominant in the Data Processing cluster. Accounting I & II, bus./off. machines, and typing I, II, III, IV were also shown to be important course offerings within the Data Processing cluster.

Of the nine additional courses listed, each was reported only once, thus showing significance only to the Data Processing cluster for the state that reported it. One state reported that the data processing course was offered for 2 years rather than one.

Three of the 22 states that indicated funding for the Data Processing cluster did not specify the courses that were funded.

Table 11

Courses Funded Within the General Clerical Cluster
(25 states)

Course	No.	%	Course	No.	%
Gen. Business ^a	5	20.0	Bus. Communication	7	28.0
Accounting I	12	48.0	Cler. Off. Proc.	18	72.0

Table 11--Continued

Course	No.	%	Course	No.	%
Accounting II	8	32.0	Coop. Off. Educ.	18	72.0
Typing I (Sem) ^a	9	36.0	Other		
Typing II (Sem) ^a	11	44.0	Bus./Off. Machines	4	16.0
Typing III (Sem)	14	56.0	Word Processing	1	4.0
Typing IV	14	56.0	Recordkeeping	3	12.0
Bus. Law	5	20.0	IOL ^b -Clerical	1	4.0
Data Proc. I (Sem)	9	36.0	Bus. Specialization	1	4.0
Data Proc. II (Sem)	7	28.0	Jr. Office Proc.	1	4.0
Bus. Math	6	24.0	Clerk Typist I & II ^c	1	4.0

^aRequired but not funded (Virginia)

^bIntensified Office Laboratory

^cTwo hours/day for 2 years

The responses shown in Table 11 above indicates that within the General Clerical cluster the courses for which funding was generally allowed were those most closely related to entry-level employment--accounting I, typing III, IV, clerical office procedures--and the related cooperative office education course.

A large number of responses were given for accounting II, typing I & II, and data processing I (semester) as an indication that

they should be strongly considered as part of the General Clerical cluster. Three states indicated funding for recordkeeping and noted it could be taken for accounting I as a requirement of the General Clerical cluster.

Five of the 25 states that indicated funding for the General Clerical cluster did not specify the courses that were funded.

Table 12
Courses Funded Within the Steno/Secretarial Cluster
(25 states)

Course	No.	%	Course	No.	%
Gen. Business ^a	4	16.0	Bus. Math	4	16.0
Accounting I	10	40.0	Sec. Off. Proc.	18	72.0
Accounting II	9	36.0	Coop. Off. Educ.	18	72.0
Typing I (Sem) ^a	9	36.0	Other		
Typing II (Sem) ^a	11	44.0	Bus./Off. Machines	2	8.0
Typing II (Sem)	15	60.0	Word Processing	1	4.0
Typing IV (Sem)	15	60.0	Model Office	3	12.0
Shorthand I (Sem)	13	53.0	IOL ^c -Secretarial	1	4.0
Shorthand II (Sem)	14	56.0	Shorthand I (Yr.)	3	12.0
Data Proc. I (Sem)	10	40.0	Shorthand II (Yr.)	3	12.0
Data Proc. II (Sem)	7	28.0	Bus. Specialization	1	4.0

Table 12--Continued

Course	No.	%	Course	No.	%
Bus. Law	5	20.0	Recordkeeping	1	4.0
Bus. Communication	7	28.0	Steno I & II ^c	1	4.0

^aRequired but not funded (Virginia)

^bIntensified Office Laboratory

^cTwo hours/day for 2 years

The respondents that indicated funding for the Steno/Secretarial cluster were in general agreement as to the courses funded within that cluster. Those courses most closely related to entry-level employment--typing III & IV, shorthand I & II (semester each), secretarial office procedures--and the related cooperative office education course were the most predominant.

A large number of responses were also given for accounting I & II, typing I & II (semester each), and data processing I (semester) as an indication that they should be strongly considered as part of the Steno/Secretarial cluster.

Three states indicated that shorthand I & II were each offered for 1 year rather than a semester. One respondent commented, "Two years of shorthand required before any reimbursement."

Five of the 25 states that indicated funding for the Steno/Secretarial cluster did not specify the courses that were funded.

Question 4C: If funding is based on courses rather than clusters, which of the following specific courses are funded?

Table 13
Courses Funded on Basis of Specific Courses
(19 states)

Course	No.	%	Course	No.	%
General Business	2	11.8	Clerical Off. Proc.	10	58.9
Typing I (Sem)	3	17.6	Secretarial Off. Proc.	10	58.9
Typing II (Sem)	4	23.5	Office Simulation	10	58.9
Typing III (Sem)	9	52.9	Reprographics	4	23.5
Typing IV (Sem)	9	52.9	Word Processing	6	35.3
Bus. Law	4	23.5	Records Management	4	23.5
Bus./Off. Machines	7	41.2	Consumer Economics	0	0.0
Personal Typing	0	0.0	Coop. Off. Educ.	11	64.7
Accounting I	5	29.4	Other		
Accounting II	9	52.9	Alphabetic Shorthand	1	5.9
Data Proc. I (Sem)	7	41.2	Recordkeeping	1	5.9
Data Proc. II (Sem)	8	47.1	Keypunch	1	5.9
Shorthand I (Sem)	7	41.2	Intro. to Data Proc.	1	5.9

Table 13--Continued

Course	No.	%	Course	No.	%
Shorthand II (Sem)	7	41.2	Shorthand III	2	11.8
Bus. Communication	4	23.5	Shorthand IV	2	11.8
Consumer Education	1	5.9			

Nine states indicated funding was allowed for secondary vocational business and office education on the basis of specific courses; 10 additional states indicated funding was based on specific courses as a combination with program "clusters".

The general pattern of funding on the basis of specific courses, as shown in Table 13, was to fund those courses that were taken primarily by junior and senior class students, basic to each of the 4 program "clusters" of Accounting, Data Processing, General Clerical and Steno/Secretarial, and most closely related to entry-level employment.

It was also shown that general business was primarily funded only if it was part of a program "cluster".

No states reported funding for personal typing or consumer economics and only 1 reported funding for consumer education. This apparently shows that states generally do not consider these courses as

vocational in nature. One respondent indicated that consumer education was a home economics course.

Three of the 10 states that reported funding on the basis of both program "clusters" and specific courses gave no response to the specific courses that were funded.

Question 5: What is the funding formula that is used in your state to determine the amount of funds that will be allocated to approved secondary vocational education programs? (Please be as specific as possible showing all criteria that are used)

Because question 5 required no specific response, and because of the extreme complexity and diverse content of funding formulas, the investigator felt a table was inappropriate; thus, the following narrative was provided for summary purposes.

Twenty-eight, or 77.8 percent, of the 36 responding states provided information concerning the funding formula or criteria used to determine allocations to approved secondary vocational education programs. Fifteen states attached a copy of the funding formula or criteria as per the State Plan for Vocational Education.

The 5 most important factors used in determining the allocation of funds to local education agencies (LEA's) are:

- (1) Relative ability of LEA to provide resources
- (2) Relative number or concentration of low income families or individuals.

- (3) Relative number of unemployed in the area served by the LEA
- (4) Assessed valuation per average daily membership for the LEA
- (5) Number of full-time equivalent students enrolled in vocational education

Additional factors used in determining the allocation of funds to LEA's are:

- (1) Total student contact hours in approved courses
- (2) Number of full-time equivalent disadvantaged or handicapped students enrolled in the vocational programs
- (3) Academic degree of instructional personnel
- (4) Enrollment proportions of male or female students in nontraditional vocational programs
- (5) Preparing students in a new emerging occupation
- (6) Organized vocational student organization
- (7) Dropout rate
- (8) Manpower needs
- (9) Maintain funding level of previous year
- (10) Impact of programs on employment

Of the 8 states that did not respond to this question, one respondent commented, "Not available--too complicated for anyone to understand"; another commented, "All formulas are used in the fiscal

office and we do not work with this part of the program"; and another commented, "This is a graduate level course in school finance and cannot be explained in this fashion!"

Question 6: As the Supervisor of Business and Office Education in your state, how do you solicit assistance from the business educators in your state in determining the appropriateness of allocations (funding formula) for secondary business and office education programs?

Table 14

Methods of Soliciting Assistance from Business Educators
in Determining the Funding Formula

Method	No.	%
School Visitation	21	58.3
Telephone	14	38.9
Correspondence	15	41.7
State Conference	19	52.8
No Input	8	22.2
No Response	3	8.3
Other		
Advisory committees	3	8.6
Local district meetings	2	5.7
Workshops and seminars	2	5.7
Public meetings	1	2.9

Table 14--Continued

Method	No.	%
Ad hoc committees	1	2.9
Annual plan from each LEA	1	2.9
Questionnaires	1	2.9
Publications	1	2.9

The responses shown in Table 14 indicate that the business educators most generally are not asked to provide assistance in determining the appropriateness of allocations in the funding formula. One respondent commented, "No such role really anymore, so determination really not done".

The two methods most often used by State Supervisors for Business and Office Education to solicit assistance from the business educators were through school visitations and state conferences.

Eight, or 22.2 percent, of the 26 respondents indicated there was no input from business educators in determining the funding formula. One respondent commented, "Most business educators are not vocational office occupations instructors". Another respondent commented, "Business educators don't have anything to do with funding formula".

Three states gave no response to this question.

Question 7: On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 indicates poor, 5 indicates excellent), how would you rate the adequacy of funding for secondary vocational business and office education programs in relation to funding for all other secondary vocational education programs in your state?

Table 15

Adequacy of Funding for Vocational Business and
Office Education in Relation to Funding for
All Other Secondary Vocational
Education Programs

Explanation: 1=Poor 2=Below Ave. 3=Ave. 4=Good 5=Excellent

Rating	No.	%
1	6	16.7
2	4	11.1
3	10	27.8
4	9	25.0
5	4	11.1
No response	3	8.3
Total	36	100.0

Table 15 above indicates that the majority of State Supervisors feel the funding for secondary vocational business and office education programs is inadequate, in relation to the funding for all other

secondary vocational education programs.

Twenty, or 55.6 percent, of the 36 respondents indicated the adequacy of funding for business and office education was average or below. Only 4, or 11.1 percent, indicated that the funding was excellent.

Of the 3 states that gave no response, two indicated there was no difference and that all programs were funded on the same formula. One respondent commented, "We represent 1/3 of the enrollment and we receive 1/3 of the funds".

Question 8: Does your state have a Comprehensive Guideline for Vocational Business and Office Education?

Table 16

Comprehensive Guideline for Vocational
Business and Office Education

Response	No.	%
Yes	24	66.7
No	8	22.2
No response	4	11.1
Total	36	100.0

As shown in Table 16 above, a large majority of the states do

have a Comprehensive Guideline for Vocational Business and Office Education.

Nine of the 24 states that reported having guidelines indicated that the guidelines were either presently being revised or needed revision.

One respondent commented, "It has not been reprinted and/or updated since 1971". Another respondent commented, "But dated 1976 with no plans to update (unfortunately)".

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Historically, business education has not received the same financial support for vocational programs as have the other areas of the secondary school curriculums. Although there has been constant effort by many Montana business and office educators and state leaders to increase the state funding for business and office education, there is no evidence of any previous study to determine the feasibility of increasing the state funding for such expanded programs.

This study of State Plans for Vocational Education in each of the 50 states was conducted during the 1979-1980 school year. The primary purpose was to compare data gathered from other states that would assist in determining the feasibility of expanding programs of secondary vocational business and office education in Montana.

To achieve this purpose, questionnaires were sent to the State Supervisor for Business and Office Education in each of the 50 states. Thirty-six of the supervisors completed and returned the questionnaire, all of which were considered useable. The responses were tabulated and summarized in Chapter 4. In this chapter, the findings have been summarized and conclusions drawn on the basis of those findings.

The findings were then related to the review of literature, and recommendations were made.

Summary of Review of Literature

Vocational education has been a significant part of the program of instruction in the American public schools for more than 60 years. Not only has it grown in the number of people it serves, but also in the occupations for which it prepares.

It is generally recognized that the cost of most vocational programs is higher than the cost of most academic programs. One justification for special financial support for vocational education has been this differential in cost. Landmark federal legislation affecting vocational education includes the Morrill Land-Grant Acts, Smith-Hughes Act, George-Barden Act, Vocational Education Act of 1963, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Vocational Amendments of 1972, and Vocational Amendments of 1976. Each of these acts has recognized the importance of vocational education and has infused increasingly larger sums of money into vocational education programs.

Wide variations in methods of financing local education programs cause real problems. Many local education agencies would like to offer a larger variety of vocational programs to give students more training options, but the financial base of the school district does not permit this to happen. Largely for this reason, the financing of vocational education has become a joint endeavor of local education agencies, the state and federal government. If school districts are to continue to emphasize vocational education, state governments must

participate in financing vocational education to a larger extent.

Vocational education programs should be structured to help students develop the skills, attitudes, and knowledge needed for entry-level employment in a "family" of related occupations (clusters). The Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education (NBEA, 1970) states that the high school curriculum should include sequences of courses that adequately prepare youth for initial employment in business. Most educators recognize the desirability of providing suggested sequences of courses to be included in the office education program.

The occupational clusters of Accounting, Data Processing, General Clerical, and Steno/Secretarial have been identified as those that should correlate very closely with the educational programs in business and office education.

The current plan for funding of vocational business education programs in Montana includes only those courses that are considered as "capstone" courses--secretarial office practice and co-op, simulated model office and co-op and clerical office practice and co-op.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings of this study.

1. State policies recognize that federal funds are an important source of funding for vocational education and generally

regard the allocation of a substantial proportion of these funds to secondary vocational education programs as desirable.

2. State legislatures recognize that if school districts are to continue to emphasize vocational education, state appropriated funding in support of secondary vocational programs is desirable.

3. A provision for the funding of prevocational courses is not a common element of the State Plans for Vocational Education, and where this provision is found, funding is allowed primarily for only industrial arts.

4. Most State Plans for Vocational Education agree that program "clusters" is the most desirable basis for funding secondary vocational business and office education.

5. Most State Plans for Vocational Education regard the funding for each of the program "clusters" of Accounting, Data Processing, General Clerical, and Steno/Secretarial to be desirable.

6. Most State Plans for Vocational Education recognize the desirability of funding a sequence of courses in a program "cluster".

7. State Supervisors for Business and Office Education generally regard the funding for secondary vocational business and office education programs, in relation to funding for all other secondary vocational programs, to be inadequate.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this

study.

1. It is recommended that a percentage of the federal vocational education funds received by the State of Montana be allocated to secondary vocational education.

2. It is recommended that the allocations for approved programs for secondary vocational business and office education in Montana be based on program clusters and that funding be expanded to include all courses in the General Clerical and Steno/Secretarial programs that lead to entry-level employment. The courses to be funded in the General Clerical cluster should include accounting I & II, typing I, II, III, IV (semester each), data processing I (semester), clerical office procedures, and cooperative office education. The courses to be funded in the Steno/Secretarial cluster should include accounting I & II, typing I, II, III, IV (semester each), shorthand I & II (semester each), data processing I (semester), secretarial office procedures, and cooperative office education.

3. It is further recommended that the secondary vocational business and office education programs in Montana be expanded to include Accounting and Data Processing clusters and that funding be approved for all courses within these clusters that lead to entry-level employment. The courses to be funded in the Accounting cluster should include accounting I & II, business/office machines, data processing I

(semester), typing III & IV (semester each), and cooperative office education. The courses to be funded in the Data Processing cluster should include data processing I & II (semester each), accounting I & II, business/office machines, typing I, II, III, IV (semester each), and cooperative office education.

4. It is recommended that the vocational business educators in Montana assist the efforts of the State Consultant for Business and Office Education to improve and expand the funding for secondary vocational business and office education in the following ways:

- a. Support the efforts of the Montana Vocational Association to improve the funding for all vocational programs.
- b. Keep informed of trends in vocational education through attendance at the annual state conference of the Montana Vocational Association.
- c. Encourage the support of all business educators in Montana for the improvement and expansion of vocational business and office education programs.

5. It is recommended that the present Business Education Curriculum Guidelines in Montana be updated and a supplement be added to include guidelines for vocational business and office education programs.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

March 10, 1980

Dear

The concern over lack of uniformity for funding of secondary vocational education programs in Montana has been expressed by various Montana business educators and state supervisors.

Useful data regarding the funding of secondary vocational business and office education programs is virtually non-existent. The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information that will assist in determining the feasibility of increasing state funding for secondary business and office education programs in Montana by identifying what each of the 50 states consider as program offerings for vocational funding within secondary business and office education curriculums.

Your experience as the Supervisor of Business and Office Education in your state will be a valuable contribution to this study. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire by March 20, 1980. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

A summary of the findings will be available to you upon request. Your assistance will be genuinely appreciated.

Sincerely

Ronald J. Miller
Montana Vocational Business Educator

Enclosures 2

APPENDIX B

NO. _____ (For follow-up purposes only)

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What percent of Federal funds intended for vocational education received by your state are allocated to secondary vocational education programs? _____ PERCENT

 2. In addition to Federal funds received for vocational education, does your state legislature provide funds for secondary vocational education? _____ YES _____ NO
 - A. What percent of the total state appropriated funds for secondary vocational education are presently allocated to secondary vocational business and office education? _____ PERCENT

 3. Does your present State Plan for Vocational Education contain a provision for funding prevocational courses? _____ YES _____ NO
 - A. Are any prevocational business and office education courses presently being funded? _____ YES _____ NO
 (Please specify course titles) _____

 4. On what basis does your present State Plan for Vocational Education allow funding for secondary vocational business and office education? (Check one of the following)

☐ Program "clusters" ☐ Specific courses ☐ Both

 - A. Which of the following program clusters are funded? Please check (✓).
☐ Accounting ☐ Data Processing ☐ General Clerical ☐ Steno/Secretarial
☐ Other (please specify) _____

 - B. Check (✓) any of the following courses that are funded within each cluster.
- | Accounting | Data Processing | General Clerical | Steno/Secretarial |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ Gen. Business | ☐ Gen. Business | ☐ Gen. Business | ☐ Gen. Business |
| ☐ Accounting I | ☐ Data Proc. I (Sem) | ☐ Accounting I | ☐ Accounting I |
| ☐ Accounting II | ☐ Data Proc. II(Sem) | ☐ Accounting II | ☐ Accounting II |
| ☐ Bus./Off. Machines | ☐ Accounting I | ☐ Typing I (Sem) | ☐ Typing I (Sem) |
| ☐ Bus. Math | ☐ Accounting II | ☐ Typing II (Sem) | ☐ Typing II (Sem) |
| ☐ Bus. Communication | ☐ Bus. Law | ☐ Typing III(Sem) | ☐ Typing III(Sem) |
| ☐ Data Proc. I (Sem) | ☐ Bus./Off. Machines | ☐ Typing IV (Sem) | ☐ Typing IV (Sem) |
| ☐ Data Proc. II(Sem) | ☐ Bus. Communication | ☐ Bus. Law | ☐ Shorthand I (Sem) |
| ☐ Typing I (Sem) | ☐ Typing I (Sem) | ☐ Data Proc. I (Sem) | ☐ Shorthand II(Sem) |
| ☐ Typing II (Sem) | ☐ Typing II (Sem) | ☐ Data Proc. II(Sem) | ☐ Data Proc. I (Sem) |
| ☐ Typing III(Sem) | ☐ Typing III(Sem) | ☐ Bus. Math | ☐ Data Proc. II(Sem) |
| ☐ Typing IV (Sem) | ☐ Typing IV (Sem) | ☐ Bus. Communication | ☐ Bus. Law |
| ☐ Bus. Law | ☐ Bus. Math | ☐ Cler. Off. Proc. | ☐ Bus. Communication |
| ☐ Coop. Off. Educ. | ☐ Coop. Off. Educ. | ☐ Coop. Off. Educ. | ☐ Bus. Math |
| ☐ Other (list) | ☐ Other (list) | ☐ Other (list) | ☐ Sec. Off. Proc. |
| | | | ☐ Coop. Off. Educ. |
| | | | ☐ Other (list) |

-OTHER SIDE-

- C. If funding is based on courses rather than clusters, which of the following specific courses are funded? Please check (✓).

☐ General Business	☐ Accounting I	☐ Clerical Off. Proc.
☐ Typing I (Sem)	☐ Accounting II	☐ Secretarial Off. Proc.
☐ Typing II (Sem)	☐ Data Proc. I (Sem)	☐ Office Simulation
☐ Typing III(Sem)	☐ Data Proc. II(Sem)	☐ Reprographics
☐ Typing IV (Sem)	☐ Shorthand I (Sem)	☐ Word Processing
☐ Business Law	☐ Shorthand II(Sem)	☐ Records Management
☐ Bus./Off. Machines	☐ Bus. Communication	☐ Consumer Economics
☐ Personal Typing	☐ Consumer Education	☐ Coop. Office Educ.
☐ Other (please specify) _____		

5. What is the funding formula that is used in your state to determine the amount of funds that will be allocated to approved secondary vocational education programs? (Please be as specific as possible showing all criteria that are used)
6. As the Supervisor for Business and Office Education in your state how do you solicit assistance from the business educators in your state in determining the appropriateness of allocations (funding formula) for secondary business and office education programs? Please check (✓) those that apply.
- ☐ School Visitation ☐ Telephone ☐ Correspondence ☐ State Conference
☐ Other (please specify) _____
7. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 indicates poor, 5 indicates excellent), how would you rate the adequacy of funding for secondary vocational business and office education programs in relation to funding for all other secondary vocational education programs in your state? Circle one
1 2 3 4 5
8. Does your state have a Comprehensive Curriculum Guideline for Vocational Business and Office Education? ☐ YES ☐ NO

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

APPENDIX C

March 29, 1980

Dear

The vocational business educators of Montana are deeply concerned over funding for vocational business and office education programs in our state. To gather information that would assist our efforts in dealing with funding, I am conducting a survey of Supervisors of Business and Office Education in each of the 50 states.

Perhaps the questionnaire I sent you earlier arrived at an inconvenient time. Although much useful data has been received, your support is vital in providing a more comprehensive assessment of funding policies for vocational business and office education.

For your convenience, another questionnaire and stamped envelope are enclosed. Your reply by April 10 would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely

Ronald J. Miller

Enclosures 2

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Vocational Association. Comprehensive Planning for Vocational Education. 1978 Yearbook.
- American Vocational Association. Contemporary Concepts in Vocational Education. 1971 Yearbook.
- American Vocational Association. "Facts and Figures on Vocational Education in the United States", American Vocational Association, November, 1979.
- American Vocational Association. Vocational Education and the Nation's Economy. 1977 Yearbook.
- Barlow, M.L. (Prog. Dir.). Policy-Making for Vocational and Career Los Angeles: University of California, 1975.
- Calhoun, Calfrey C. and Alton V. Finch. Vocational and Career Education: Concepts and Operations. Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., Belmont, California, 1976.
- Connover, Hobart H. and Willard R. Daggett. "Business Education--The Changing Tide." The Balance Sheet, September, 1976: 16-17.
- Evans, Rupert N. and Edwin L. Herr. Foundations of Vocational Education, 2nd ed. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., Columbus, Ohio, 1978.
- Flanagan, John C., "Functional Education for the Seventies," Phi Delta Kappa, September, 1967, pp. 27-33.
- Garrison, Lloyd L., "Economics Roles, Goals, and Curricula in Business and Office Education." American Vocational Association, 1977 Yearbook.
- Hansen, W. Lee, ed. "Symposium of Rates of Return to Investment in Education." Journal of Human Resources 2 (Summer 1967): 291-374.
- Hopkins, Charles O., "Decision Making Investments in Vocational Education." American Vocational Association, 1977 Yearbook.

- Kaufman, Jacob J., Teh-Wei Hu, Mawlin Lee, and Ernst W. Stromsdorfer. A Cost-Effectiveness Study of Vocational Education. Final Report, Project No. OE 512, U.S. Office of Education, University Park, PA: Institute for Research on Human Resources, The Pennsylvania State Univeristy, October, 1968.
- Kaufman, Jess C., "Business and Office Occupations, The Cluster Approach--A Position Paper." State Department of Education, Division of Instructional Support, Career Education, Salem, Oregon, 1975.
- Kraft, Richard H.P., ed. Education and Economic Growth. Proceedings of the first Annual Conference on the Economics of Education. Tallahassee, Florida: Educational Systems Development Center, Florida State University, 1968.
- Levin, Henry M., James W. Guthrie, George B. Kleindorfer, and Robert T. Stout, "School Achievement and Post-School Success: A Review." Review of Educational Research 41 (February, 1971): 1-15.
- Maley, Donald, "The Cluster Concept: Chance for Occupational Exploration." American Vocational Journal, October, 1967, pp. 22-24.
- Market Data Retrieval. The Guide to Vocational Education in America: Trends to 1978. Market Data Retrieval, Inc., 1976.
- National Business Education Association. Curriculum Development in Education for Business. 1977 Yearbook.
- National Business Education Association. "We Believe That." Business Education Forum, Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education, October, 1970.
- Office of Public Instruction. Annual Plan for Vocational Education in Montana FY 1979. Montana, 1978.
- Office of Public Instruction. Business Education Curriculum Guidelines. Montana, 1971.
- Office of Public Instruction. Guidelines for Vocational Education in Montana. Montana, 1980.

Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. The Development and Testing of A Linear Programming Technique for Optimizing Occupational Training Program Combinations. (ED 118 746). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1974.

Schultz, Theodore, W. The Economic Value of Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Schultz, Theodore, W. "The Rate of Return in Allocating Investment Resources to Education." Journal of Human Resources 2 (Summer, 1967): 293-309.

Swanson, J. Chester, "Criteria for Effective Vocational Education," American Vocational Association, 1971 Yearbook, pp. 21-26.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Office of Adult, Vocational, Technical and Manpower Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education. Summary Data Vocational Education: 1975. Vocational Education Information, No. I.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Center for Adult, Vocational, Technical, and Manpower Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education. Trends in Vocational Education, Fiscal Year 1974. Vocational Education Information, No. II.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1976-1977 ed. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

Weisbrod, Burton A., "Investing in Human Capital." Journal of Human Resources 1 (Summer 1966b): 1-21.