

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE
COORDINATED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND
TRAINING PROGRAM IN PREVENTING
DROPOUTS WITHIN THE STATE
OF OKLAHOMA

By

VERNA GAYLE BULLARD

Bachelor of Science in Education

Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Durant, Oklahoma

1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1983

Thesis
1983
B935a
cop. 2



AN ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE
COORDINATED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND
TRAINING PROGRAM IN PREVENTING
DROPOUTS WITHIN THE STATE
OF OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

Wayne B. James

Thesis Adviser

Wm. D. Ferguson

John L. Baird

Norman D. Decker

Dean of Graduate College



Handwritten text, possibly a signature or name, located in the lower-middle section of the page. The text is faint and difficult to decipher.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher wishes to express gratitude to the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education for making this study possible and acknowledge members of the staff who contributed greatly to the study: Dr. Tom Thomas, Dr. Don Frazier, Ms. Billie Frazier, Ms. Debbie Reimer and Dr. Clyde Matthews. Sincere appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Wayne James for serving as the major adviser. Appreciation is extended to Dr. Don Frazier and Dr. John Baird for their guidance and service as committee members. The researcher also wishes to express a special thanks to her parents, and Jeff and Vic, for their encouragement and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Need for the Study	3
Purpose of the Study	3
Objectives of the Study	3
Scope	3
Limitations of the Study	4
Assumptions	4
Definitions	4
Organization of the Study	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Identification of the Dropout	6
Dropout Prevention Programs	8
Oklahoma's CVET Program	10
Oklahoma's Dropouts	12
Implications of Vocational Education	14
Summary	15
III. DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY	16
Introduction	16
The Study Sample	16
Collection of the Data	17
Analysis of Data	18
IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	20
Enrollment and Dropout Data	20
District and CVET Dropout Rates	22
Dropout Patterns	27
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	40
Summary	40
Conclusions	41
Recommendations	42
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	44

Chapter	Page
APPENDICES	46
APPENDIX A - ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SCHOOLS	47
APPENDIX B - DISTRICT AND CVET ENROLLMENT/ DROPOUT--RAW DATA.	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. District and CVET Enrollment/Dropout Totals for 53 Schools by Year--Raw Data	21
II. District and CVET Dropout Rates for Each School by Year	23
III. Correlated T Test Results for District and CVET Dropout Rates by Year	26
IV. Summary of Dropout Pattern Exhibited by Tenth Grade Students Enrolled in CVET Programs 1978-79	28
V. Summary of Dropout Pattern Exhibited by Tenth Grade Students Enrolled in CVET Programs 1979-80	31
VI. Summary of Dropout Pattern Exhibited by Tenth Grade Students Enrolled in CVET Programs 1980-81	33
VII. Summary of Dropout Pattern Exhibited by Tenth Grade Studnets Enrolled in CVET Programs 1981-82	35
VIII. Summary of Totals for Tenth Grade CVET Student Dropping Out by Year and Grade	37
IX. Analysis of Variance for Tenth Grade CVET Dropouts by Year and Grade	39
X. District and CVET Enrollment/Dropouts for Each School by Year--Raw Data	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A major concern shared by our nation's educational institutions today is the number of students dropping out or leaving the system (Minnesota State Department of Education, 1981). The numerous factors contributing to this exit are varied and complex, in many cases the reasons are obscure. Because of the vague and mysterious qualities related to the reasons students leave the educational system early, recent studies (Martin, 1981; Glaser and Kley, 1982) have placed a major emphasis on identification of dropouts and potential early school leavers. In order to prevent future growth of this problem, many school systems have identified the potential leavers and developed a program of instruction based on the special needs of the students.

Growth in the interest of meeting the needs of the disadvantaged and handicapped has been shown through recent legislation (Griffin, 1983; Weisburg, 1983). However, today's disadvantaged and handicapped students confront situations within the educational system that are at times discouraging, degrading and detrimental to their psychological image (Altifest, 1975). This damage to the students' self image and the lack of relevance to personal needs and purposes contribute to the desire of many potential dropouts to leave school (Greene, 1966).

In addition to the dropout problem, America faces the adjustment to changes resulting from a technological-oriented society. Today's students are influenced by the rapid growth of technical occupations and the rising need for

education/training in these fields. Vocational education must play a significant role in a society preparing for technological careers and entry into the present rapidly changing work force (Shoemaker, 1975).

Current vocational and technical programs are designed for youth 16 years of age and older; however, as cited by Rhodes (1970), there is a need for implementation of programs designed for youth aged 14 and 15. The consensus of those who have studied the problem of early school leavers is that the peak age at which most students drop out of school is shortly after reaching 16 years of age and the grade levels from which they most commonly exit are the ninth and tenth (Greene, 1966).

Out of a concern to resolve these existing conflicts, the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education began, in 1970-71, the implementation of a program designed specifically to meet the needs of disadvantaged and handicapped youth in the ninth and tenth grades. Although the common goal of all vocational program's to educate and train students in the skills necessary to acquire employment, according to an article published in "Expressions," in March 1980, Volume II, Number 3 (cited in Frazier, 1980), a primary objective of the Coordinated Vocational Education and Training (CVET) program is to keep the student in school. This program was designed to prepare disadvantaged and handicapped students for success in traditional high school or area vocational school courses and in the skills necessary for employment within the work force (Matthews, 1976).

Statement of the Problem

A primary objective of CVET programs is to keep the student in school. The specific problem with which this study dealt was the effectiveness of CVET programs in preventing student dropouts in Oklahoma.

Need for the Study

A need existed within the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education for examining dropout patterns in order to determine the effectiveness of the CVET program and to accumulate information to be used for program planning.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to determine the effectiveness of CVET programs in preventing student dropouts in the State of Oklahoma, and (2) to examine the dropout pattern exhibited by early school leavers.

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Are CVET programs effective in keeping potential student dropouts in school?
2. What dropout pattern is exhibited by students enrolled in CVET programs?

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were:

1. To compare district dropout data to CVET dropout data in order to determine differences between the dropout rates.
2. To identify any significant mean differences of district and CVET dropout rates.
3. To examine the dropout pattern exhibited by students enrolled in CVET.

Scope

This study included student dropouts and the CVET students in the state of

Oklahoma over a four-year period beginning with the school year 1978-79 through school year 1981-82.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited by information in the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education files from which the data were obtained.

Assumptions

The study was conducted based upon the following assumptions:

1. Students enrolled in CVET are potential dropouts.
2. Tenth grade students enrolled in CVET were assumed to be completing the second year of the program.

Definitions

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study:

CVET Programs--Refers to Coordinated Vocational Education and Training programs designed specifically for in-school disadvantaged and handicapped ninth and tenth grade students.

Disadvantaged Students--Persons other than physically handicapped with special needs due to academic or economic handicaps who require special services in order to succeed in vocational education programs (Altifest, 1975).

Dropouts and Early School Leavers--Students who leave school before graduation or completion of a program and do not continue their education elsewhere.

Effectiveness--Refers to the yielding of results and production of usefulness or service.

Handicapped Students--Persons identified with physical handicaps

according to federal laws and state standards who require special services and modification of traditional vocational programs (Altifest, 1975).

Special Needs Students (Special Population)--Persons identified as being handicapped and/or disadvantaged.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduces the study by presenting a statement of the problem, need for the study, purpose, objectives, scope and limitation, assumptions and definition of terms. Chapter II presents a review of related literature concerning identification of potential dropouts, dropout prevention programs, Oklahoma's CVET programs, dropout reports for Oklahoma, and implications for vocational education. Chapter III includes the procedures utilized in this study, including the selection of schools, collection of data and analysis of data. Chapter IV reports the findings of the study, while Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for practice and further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter includes a review of the following areas: (1) Identification of potential dropouts, (2) Current dropout prevention programs, (3) Oklahoma's CVET program, (4) Student dropouts in Oklahoma, and (5) Implications for vocational education.

Identification of the Dropout

In 1963, President Kennedy expressed his concern for the youth of America through his State of the Union message to Congress:

The future of any country which is dependent on the will and wisdom of its citizens is damaged, and irreparably damaged, whenever any of its children is not educated to the fullest extent of his capacity, from grade school through graduate school. Today, an estimated four out of every 10 students in the fifth grade will not even finish high school --and that is a waste we cannot afford (Schreiber, 1964, n.p.).

Twenty years later in 1983, the mystery surrounding the dropout and potential school leaver is still not fully understood or resolved. Since the reasons for dropping out are multiple, interrelated and complex, a major objective in dealing with dropouts and potential dropouts is the identification of common characteristics or sequential behaviors that may denote a desire to leave the school system (Greene, 1966). In order to prevent students from leaving the school system the potential dropout must first be identified.

Identifying the potential dropout is probably the single most important factor in any program geared to prevent school dropouts. This seemingly simple task is complicated because of the variety and pattern of factors which cause young people to drop out of school, unfortunately, there is no single or simple formula for measuring the

potential dropout. Each student must be examined in view of the forces which impel him to leave school (Greene, 1966, p. 31).

As evidenced by the large number of recent studies, school systems in many states share a concern for the number of dropouts and potential dropouts. Although a "typical" dropout does not exist because of the variance of environmental, educational and social factors affecting each situation, this recent multiplicity of studies has yielded a somewhat standard profile of the potential dropout (Minnesota State Department of Education, 1981).

Ten generally agreed upon identifiable characteristics include (Schreiber, 1964; Greene, 1966; Altifest, 1975):

1. Dissatisfaction with school;
2. Little or no participation in school activities;
3. Older than normal for grade level;
4. Record of poor attendance;
5. Low self-concept;
6. Experienced failure;
7. Difficulty with basic academic skills (reading and math);
8. Low levels of emotional and social maturity;
9. Membership in families of low economic status, educational advancement, and job status; and
10. Negative behavior patterns.

Another factor that has contributed significantly to the complexity of the dropout issue is the grade level from which the student exits (Schreiber, 1964). According to Rhodes (1970), the age of the dissatisfied student was a determining factor in the process of leaving the educational system:

Guidance studies have found youth at the age of 14 or 15 too young to make a reasonable occupation choice, therefore, the vocational education programming has been planned for youth 16 years of age and older. In spite of the research regarding the age of reasonable occupational choice, the experiences of local school systems,

particularly in major cities, indicated some new type of programming should be provided for youth at age 14. Unless some special type of programming can be provided to dropout prone youth at age 14 and 15, they would not be available at age 16 to enroll in vocational programming relevant to their interests and needs (p. 130).

The results of a national survey indicated that alienation towards school, a contributing factor to dropping out, occurs in early junior high school several years before the potential dropout can legally leave school (Campbell, 1968). Because of age constraints placed upon potential leavers by law in many states, a phenomenon known as a "psychological dropout" has developed (Greene, 1966; Rhodes, 1970). A student may exhibit some or all of the characteristics of a potential dropout but is not legally old enough to leave the school system. Psychologically this student has "dropped out" and is waiting for an opportunity to actually exit from the system.

There is almost virtual agreement that the dropout is not the product of a hurriedly-made decision. Rather, he is a result of many years of failure and rejection. He has had a long period of time to develop a poor self-concept and unhealthy attitudes toward school and school personnel, and he has had lots of help all along the way. In short, leaving school is only the end of a process that began many years earlier (Greene, 1966, p. 32).

Despite the fact that recent research has established general characteristics, age and mind-set of the early leaver, it is still recognized that every student is a potential dropout, and the specific needs of the individual must be taken into consideration as problems surface. In response to this, several noteworthy dropout prevention programs have been instigated.

Dropout Prevention Programs

Once a system for identification of the potential dropout has been established, based on the criteria of the school system, a method of dealing with this early school leaver is needed. Out of a growing concern to alleviate this problem many states have implemented programs designed for dropout

prevention.

A study conducted on obviating the dropout problem within the State of Minnesota reported positive results utilizing the South Community Partnership Program in Minneapolis (Minnesota State Department of Education, 1981). This program placed emphasis on the development of employment skills rather than job placement. A partnership atmosphere and a feeling of belonging were created by the program with out-reach workers serving as links to the dropouts' homes and schools. It was concluded that the program provided stimulus to students for improving basic skills and attitudes toward school in order to prepare for successful employment.

A dropout prevention program named the Harbor City Learning Program was organized in Baltimore in 1973. This program centered work and education around job clusters. On the job training was alternated with mini-schools on a two week basis, giving youth the opportunity to participate in a variety of work experiences. Youth accumulated credit toward graduation as well as the minimum wage for job experiences (Minnesota State Department of Education, 1981).

A one- or two-year ungraded vocational program for 14- and 15-year olds identified as potential dropouts known as the Occupational Work Program was begun in Ohio in 1967. The goal of the program was to aid students in the successful completion of a vocational or academic program, and encourage the students to return to the academic mainstream for the remainder of their education. The students involved attended special classes together as well as regular classes. The program was sponsored by Ohio's State Department of Education through the Division of Vocational Education (Glaser and Kley, 1982; Rhodes, 1970).

The Work and Career Exploration Program (WECEP), operating in

Wisconsin and Illinois was designed to offer both work experience and related classes to 14- and 15-year old dropout prone students. A major aim of the program is an amelioration of the dropout problem offering vocational education courses to interested youth (Lukas, 1981).

Because, as noted earlier, there is no "typical" dropout, there is no one program designed to fulfill all needs or provide a perfect solution. Original ideas must harmonize with the unique circumstances of a particular community (Minnesota State Department of Education, 1981). However, successful dropout prevention programs have been developed in certain communities as a means for the rectification of this problem.

Oklahoma's CVET Program

In the past, the vocational potential of the special population has been virtually ignored. However, recent emphasis on productivity within the work force has furthered the attitudinal development of consideration for the disadvantaged and handicapped as positive contributors for the regeneration of our nation's economy (Bottoms, 1983). Through demonstrated concern and public acknowledgment of the productive potential of the special population, several pieces of legislation have been passed which have resulted in projects and programs designed to assist persons with special needs.

Three pieces of legislation that have evolved as a result of this concern and have contributed notable changes to America's educational and employment systems are (1) PL 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975; (2) PL 94-482, The Education Amendments of 1976 Title II--Vocational Education; and (3) PL 93-516, Section 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Albright and Phelps, 1979).

Despite the existing attention and concern for special needs, many

disadvantaged and handicapped students continue to view school as a dreaded experience (Altifest, 1975). According to Rhodes (1970),

We not only have dropouts. We have pushouts, throwouts, and shoveouts who have long ago been abandoned by the system and who will leave that system when they can no longer stand the indignities imposed upon them by the system, or put up with the antiquated educational offerings made available to them by that system. Many of the dropouts from our schools do not lack the capacities to complete school--they lack the will to continue to run a meaningless race (p. 118).

Out of a concern to resolve these existing conflicts, the Coordinated Vocational Education and Training Program was introduced into 16 high school systems in 1970-71. CVET programs were specifically designed to educate and train disadvantaged/handicapped students in the ninth and tenth grades.

A major emphasis is placed on training in the skills necessary to acquire employment and development of the student's ability to succeed in regular vocational and academic programs. In short, a primary objective of the CVET program is to keep potential dropouts in school in order to develop and train these students in salable skills needed in the work force (Frazier, 1980).

Both vocational and related general education courses are offered through this program. The vocational courses offered are: mechanics, construction, home and community, horticulture, business and office, and printing. Related basic skills are offered through required English and math, while optional science and social studies classes are also available. Vocational instruction is conducted for two continuous hours each day while coursework in academic and elective courses are offered during the remainder of the day (Matthews, 1976; Frazier, 1980).

In a follow up study conducted by Matthews (1976), on the effectiveness of CVET programs, it was concluded:

The CVET program is a very valuable component of the total vocational education in Oklahoma. This program provides training to

freshmen and sophomores with special needs that other programs fail to reach. The program has motivated many to continue in school rather than to drop out (p. 52).

Another study conducted by Frazier (1980), listed positive results in several case studies of CVET students and in analyzation of follow-up data on CVET completion. The study reported that of the ten dropout prone students examined through case studies, eight graduated from high school. Their grades improved after entering CVET and an obvious change in attitude toward school was noted. Frazier found the most recurring theme coming from the case studies to be a complete lack of negative remarks concerning the CVET program during the interviews. In addition to these case studies, the follow up data examined indicated that students' ability to succeed in regular vocational classes was enhanced by participation in a CVET program.

Despite positive responses to CVET, this study did not substantiate that the special programs were meeting one of their primary objectives, that of keeping potential dropouts in school. As concluded by Frazier (1980, p.35), "There is some question that the objective of keeping the student in school is adequately met by CVET programs."

Oklahoma's Dropouts

Within Oklahoma, Senate Bill No. 518 referred to as the dropout law designates the responsibility of the tabulation of dropout statistics to the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. The compilation of this data is achieved through the interchange of monthly dropout reports between administrator's of the state's public or private middle, junior high, high school and other accredited institutions of higher education and the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education.

Schools accredited by the State Department of Education are mandated to

report the name, address, age and race of any student/students exiting from the educational system the previous month. Data are stored in the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education's computer files and utilized for referral purposes to state or federal agencies, dropout recruitment and other contact purposes. Annually, a demographic report of the state's dropouts through the twelfth grade is compiled by the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education and presented by the State Department of Education to the state legislature.

Examination of statistics within the 1979-82 dropout reports indicated a declivity in the total number of dropouts through grade 12. Tabulated results of the total number of dropouts yielded 10,418 students withdrawing during the 1981-82 school year, and in 1980-81 11,346 early school leavers were noted. Dropouts enumerated within the 1979-80 and 1978-79 reports totaled 12,925 and 14,323 respectively (Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, 1982).

Although the dropout data included in the 1979-82 reports are not compared proportionally to enrollment figures, the greatest number of dropouts reported generally appear to be white males, 16-17 years of age and in the eleventh grade. Additional demographic information included in the 1981 and 1982 reports yielded three primary reasons students exit from the educational system; (1) lack of interest, (2) non-attendance, and (3) unknown. Although the rank of the reasons vary for the two years examined, they are primary and reoccurring.

An analysis of the statewide dropout population for school years 1979-82 (Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, 1983) indicated that a significant relationship does exist between the race and grade of a dropout. However, it was concluded that significant relationships do not exist

between the sex and race of a dropout or the sex and grade of a dropout.

Implications for Vocational Education

Continuing controversy exists among educators concerning the holding power of vocational education programs. The evidence is dependent on the year and place the research is conducted (Rhode Island State Department of Education, 1978). However, many recent studies suggest the availability of vocational programs on the secondary level has been a factor in preventing students from leaving school early (Bottoms and Copa, 1983). Weisburg (1983) suggests the problems of alienation and dropping out can be overcome through vocational education's hands-on learning approach.

The rapid growth in demand for and scarce supply of workers in technical occupations speaks vividly to the need for vocational technical education for today's student (Bottoms, 1983). Traditionally the primary objective of vocational education has been to educate/train students in the skills necessary to acquire employment in the work force. Wacker (1981) suggests vocational education can help to curb the unemployment rate and increase many students' chance of remaining in school through expansion and improvement of services to dropouts and potential dropouts.

According to Weber (1982) perhaps the only means available to combat the dropout problem is vocational education combined with a strong basic academic skills program. A study conducted on vocational education and basic skills found that potential dropouts could frequently be found in vocational education and former dropouts often return to school to gain training useful for future employment.

According to Wacker (1981),

Increasing numbers of students are opting to pursue a vocational curriculum in high school since future demand for skilled workers will

increase. Because of this, vocational education is in a prime position to contribute to the reduction of the dropout rate. After being exposed to skill training as well as learning techniques which reflect the special needs of individual students, more students may choose to remain in school and become gainfully employed for the rest of their lives (pp. 21-22).

Summary

Literature reviewed has spoken to identification of potential dropouts through the examination of specific characteristics and various programs instigated as remedial measures. Additionally, attention was directed toward society's recent concern with the needs of the special population and a program within Oklahoma designed specifically for potential dropouts identified as disadvantaged and handicapped was reviewed. It has also been demonstrated through the literature that the role of vocational education in today's technological society is a major influence on our nation's students and a possible contributing factor to reducing the number of dropouts.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of Coordinated Vocational Education and Training (CVET) programs in meeting the objective of preventing student dropouts in Oklahoma. In addition, the dropout pattern of early school leavers was also examined. This chapter includes a description of the population sampled, method of collecting data, and procedures for analyzing the data.

The Study Sample

The sample used in this investigation consisted of students enrolled in 53 schools, each of which offered CVET programs consecutively over a four-year period from 1978-79 school year through 1981-82 school year. There was a total of 2,123 students enrolled in CVET in the 53 schools during 1978-79. In 1979-80, a total of 2,009 students was enrolled in CVET and in 1980-81, 2,045 CVET students was enrolled in the 53 schools. A total of 2,134 students was enrolled in CVET programs in the 53 schools during 1981-82.

This same sample was utilized to examine the dropout pattern of students enrolled in CVET programs. An alphabetical list of the 53 schools used in the study is included in Appendix A.

Collection of the Data

CVET enrollment and district dropout data used in the study were drawn from computer files maintained by the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. Total school district enrollment data were taken from accreditation enrollment files maintained by the State Department of Education and accessible to the Vocational and Technical Division.

District dropout and CVET enrollment data were collected for school years 1979-82. Computer printouts listed the student's last name, first and middle initial and grade level by school. The two files were then hand matched by the investigator to determine the number of CVET students dropping out during each specific year examined.

A chart tallying the statistics for each year was maintained. Listed on the chart were the code number and name of schools with CVET programs in operation during four consecutive years. Also included on the chart were both the total number of students enrolled in the school district and dropouts from the district. A district dropout rate for each of the 53 schools was calculated from this information. In addition to district statistics, CVET dropout and enrollment data were recorded on the chart. A CVET dropout rate was calculated from this information for each of the schools.

If zero dropouts were reported by the district to the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, it was listed as such. However, in some cases, district dropouts were not reported and the data were recorded as unavailable. In these instances, the number of CVET dropouts could not be determined.

Examination of the pattern of leaving the school system established by the dropouts was accomplished by tracking the tenth grade students enrolled in CVET during the four-year period examined. Tenth grade CVET students

enrolled for a particular year were traced through the dropout data for the next two consecutive years to determine a pattern of exiting from the system. In some cases, particularly in junior high schools, no tenth grade students were enrolled and ninth grade students were tracked through the tenth and eleventh grades. Information was recorded denoting the tenth graders enrolled and dropping out the same year, as well as those dropping out the following year as an eleventh grader or two years later from the twelfth grade. Subsequently, percentages of early school leavers as well as students remaining in school were calculated for each of the 53 schools during each of the four years.

Analysis of Data

Analysis of the data was accomplished through the use of descriptive research methods for each of the two research questions posed. The questions were:

1. Are CVET programs effective in keeping potential student dropouts in school?
2. What dropout pattern is exhibited by students enrolled in CVET programs?

In response to question one, the following null hypothesis was constructed:

H_0 There is no significant difference between the mean district dropout rate and the CVET mean program dropout rate.

A correlated t test was used to test for significance. The test was performed upon the district and CVET rates for each of the four years. The following formula was utilized (Linton and Gallo, 1975, p. 212).

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_D}{S_D/\sqrt{N}}$$

In response to question two, tenth grade students enrolled in CVET during a specific year were traced through dropout data for the next two consecutive

years. These data were divided into four sections. The first section consisted of tenth grade CVET enrollees for each of the four years dropping out during the tenth grade. The second section included tenth grade CVET students exiting the following year or from the eleventh grade during each of the four years. The third section contained tenth grade CVET enrollees dropping from the twelfth grade, and the fourth section consisted of the total number of tenth grade CVET students dropping out by year.

The following null hypotheses were constructed:

- H₀ Mean dropout rates for all tenth grade CVET students enrolled and dropping out of the tenth grade were drawn from populations having the same means.
- H₀ Mean dropout rates for all tenth grade CVET students enrolled for a specific year and dropping out the following year were drawn from populations having the same means.
- H₀ Mean dropout rates for all tenth grade CVET students enrolled for a specific year and dropping out two years later were drawn from populations having the same means.
- H₀ Mean dropout rates for the total number of tenth grade CVET students dropping out by year were drawn from populations having the same means.

The .05 level of significance for rejection or failure to reject the hypotheses was set by the researcher.

A one-way between subjects Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) (Linton and Gallo, 1975), was performed upon each of the four sections to test for significant differences between the years (or groups). For testing purposes, the four years were treated as four groups. In some cases, complete data were not yet available. For instance, tenth grade students enrolled in CVET during 1980-81 could not be traced during the twelfth grade as the data were not yet available. Therefore, in the analysis of variance test, the number of the groups (or years) differ for each section.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

As stated previously, the purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to determine the effectiveness of CVET programs in preventing student dropouts, and (2) to examine the dropout pattern exhibited by early school leavers.

In order to fulfill the purpose of the study, the development of two specific research questions was necessary. The research questions were:

1. Are CVET programs effective in keeping potential student dropouts in school?
2. What dropout pattern is exhibited by students enrolled in CVET programs?

The following presentation describes the results of statistical tests relating to the research questions and formulated hypotheses. Findings are organized to review (1) the totals of enrollment and dropout data, (2) district and CVET dropout rates, and (3) dropout patterns.

Enrollment and Dropout Data

As displayed in Table I, the total district enrollment for the 53 schools during 1978-79 was 52,476, while the CVET enrollment totaled 2,123. In 1979-80, the district enrollment was 50,146 and the total CVET enrollment was 2,009. During 1980-81, the district enrollment was 47,053 and the CVET enrollment was 2,045. In 1981-82, district enrollment totaled 44,643 and the total number of CVET enrollees was 2,134.

The total number of district dropouts for 1978-79 was 5,121 and the total

TABLE I
 DISTRICT AND CVET ENROLLMENT/DROPOUT
 TOTALS FOR 53 SCHOOLS BY YEAR
 RAW DATA

Year	Total District Enrollment	Total District Dropouts	Total CVET Enrollment	Total CVET Dropouts
1978-79	52,476	5,121	2,123	138
1979-80	50,146	4,270	2,009	112
1980-81	47,053	3,742	2,045	147
1981-82	44,643	3,704	2,134	143
Total for Four Years	194,318	16,837	8,311	540

number of CVET students dropping out of school was 138. In 1979-80, the district dropouts totaled 4,270 and 112 dropouts were tallied for the CVET program. The number of district dropouts for 1980-81 was 3,742, while the CVET program totaled 147 students dropping out of school. During 1981-82, the total number of district dropouts was 3,704 and the CVET program totaled 143 students dropping out of school.

District and CVET Dropout Rates

Data displayed in Table II enumerate the district and CVET dropout rates for each school by year. Raw data relating to the dropout rates are presented in Appendix B.

As indicated in Table II, the mean of the district dropout rate exceeded the CVET program dropout rate for three of the four years examined. During 1978-79, the district mean was calculated to be 7.66 and the CVET mean was 5.60. The following year in 1979-80, the district mean was 6.59 and the CVET mean was 4.37. In 1980-81, the district mean was calculated to be 6.17, while the calculated CVET mean was 6.30. The 1981-82 data indicated the district mean was 6.05 and the CVET mean to be 4.42.

District dropout rates ranged from zero (listed five times) to a high of 26.87 percent for School 19 during 1979-80. Data for School 3 listed low district dropout rates across each of the four years examined. These dropout rates were 1.09, 1.09, 1.35 and 1.92 respectively. School 19 had a calculated dropout rate exceeding 22 percent for each year. However, a gradual decline is reflected in both the sum and mean of the district dropout rates across the four years examined.

CVET dropout rates ranged from zero (listed 78 times) to 38.0 percent for School 12 during 1980-81. Both Schools 10 and 24 had zero CVET dropouts listed

TABLE II
DISTRICT AND CVET DROPOUT RATES FOR EACH
SCHOOL BY YEAR

School	1978-79		1979-80		1980-81		1981-82	
	Dist. %	CVET %	Dist. %	CVET %	Dist. %	CVET %	Dist. %	CVET %
1	6.33	10.00	9.71	4.00	10.42	12.50	4.43	0.00
2	13.75	10.00	6.62	4.76	7.50	8.70	12.50	0.00
3	1.09	0.00	1.09	0.00	1.35	3.70	1.92	0.00
4	13.01	9.30	10.43	3.13	3.53	0.00	3.98	8.33
5	6.20	8.70	4.37	0.00	4.48	6.25	5.33	6.67
6	2.91	0.00	3.43	0.00	1.29	0.00	10.43	5.88
7	3.55	7.41	2.06	0.00	3.24	6.45	4.55	0.00
8	9.95	4.17	5.10	4.17	2.70	9.09	0.00	0.00
9	6.39	7.41	4.82	3.45	5.90	3.03	4.58	0.00
10	7.99	0.00	4.71	0.00	4.85	0.00	3.55	0.00
11	3.63	0.00	6.62	3.23	5.17	0.00	6.35	0.00
12	9.64	28.00	10.07	25.00	17.92	36.00	12.27	31.03
13	15.38	3.13	11.86	0.00	12.24	10.00	12.70	3.45
14	6.86	7.69	7.81	0.00	4.52	4.17	1.67	0.00
15	9.04	3.85	6.12	3.03	6.51	16.00	4.73	3.85
16	6.87	3.70	8.25	4.00	9.62	13.64	7.80	3.70
17	4.72	0.00	3.23	0.00	3.92	5.56	5.31	4.35
18	7.48	6.45	7.94	4.76	2.74	7.69	1.78	0.00
19	22.73	10.71	26.87	4.00	22.93	9.09	25.16	14.29
20	5.60	0.00	7.62	7.41	3.40	0.00	2.41	7.14
21	5.41	3.13	5.28	0.00	2.26	0.00	6.11	9.09
22	7.02	5.88	7.07	9.38	10.20	10.00	11.58	10.71
23	5.94	10.00	4.14	0.00	3.65	0.00	1.26	0.00
24	3.23	0.00	1.85	0.00	2.24	0.00	2.13	0.00
25	9.42	9.09	11.65	13.79	4.97	6.25	6.19	0.00
26	1.60	0.00	5.59	4.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
27	+	+	6.67	3.70	5.45	0.00	6.88	7.41
28	11.55	6.67	11.11	16.39	9.32	11.67	7.82	8.11
29	6.13	11.11	4.04	2.94	1.67	4.35	1.86	0.00
30	5.59	3.23	8.04	6.67	6.05	7.69	2.79	0.00
31	17.96	10.00	6.90	8.33	7.29	0.00	7.12	0.00
32	10.08	17.65	8.42	8.26	7.35	6.62	9.54	9.76
33	4.05	0.00	4.01	0.00	6.15	2.22	10.83	8.00
34	6.25	10.00	5.06	0.00	5.19	6.25	3.32	20.00
35	9.33	0.00	6.12	0.00	4.79	0.00	7.78	11.54
36	9.27	2.78	1.48	8.33	2.83	0.00	6.74	11.11
37	6.67	3.57	3.45	0.00	5.66	12.50	3.66	0.00
38	5.92	12.50	1.81	4.17	0.00	0.00	5.85	0.00
39	3.98	11.11	5.35	0.00	3.41	0.00	3.47	0.00
40	4.84	1.28	2.47	1.35	1.86	1.20	2.61	0.00
41	6.75	8.82	6.29	5.88	3.15	6.06	5.02	0.00
42	5.44	0.00	7.75	4.76	8.66	9.09	6.35	5.88

TABLE II (Continued)

School	1978-79		1979-80		1980-81		1981-82	
	Dist. %	CVET %	Dist. %	CVET %	Dist. %	CVET %	Dist. %	CVET %
43	7.33	9.46	8.93	8.33	12.34	8.96	10.54	9.72
44	4.68	3.45	7.82	8.33	16.33	8.00	7.69	0.00
45	15.78	9.52	7.32	10.84	9.13	12.64	6.90	7.69
46	16.13	0.00	11.11	12.50	8.20	6.67	5.19	0.00
47	8.31	2.94	12.66	7.14	16.43	21.74	9.36	7.69
48	7.60	3.45	2.05	0.00	2.46	7.69	0.00	0.00
49	5.05	5.56	3.35	0.00	3.87	0.00	5.62	0.00
50	4.91	0.00	1.78	0.00	3.13	3.33	6.02	3.33
51	4.82	0.00	7.37	7.14	5.53	14.29	4.50	3.45
52	11.43	9.63	11.13	7.78	10.06	9.68	10.19	12.20
53	2.52	0.00	2.33	0.00	2.89	5.26	4.02	0.00
Sum	398.11	291.35	349.13	231.49	326.75	334.03	320.39	234.38
Mean	7.66	5.60	6.59	4.37	6.17	6.30	6.05	4.42
Overall Dropout Rate	9.76	6.50	8.52	5.57	7.95	7.19	8.30	6.70

+District dropout information was not reported, CVET dropouts could not be determined.

NOTE: Percents are rounded to nearest hundredth.

for each of the four years examined. As indicated for School 40, the dropout rates calculated for both the district and CVET program did not exceed 5.00.

During 1978-79, the overall dropout rate for the 53 school districts was calculated to be 9.76 and the overall CVET dropout rate was 6.50. The overall dropout rate during 1979-80 for the 53 school districts was calculated to be 8.52 and the CVET rate was 5.57. In 1980-81, the overall district dropout rate for the 53 schools was computed to be 7.95 and the overall CVET dropout rate calculated was 7.19. The overall dropout rate for the 53 school districts during 1981-82 was calculated to be 8.30 and the CVET rate was 6.70.

Data displayed in Table III denote the results of the correlated t test for the mean of the difference between the district and CVET dropout rates by year. The mean difference of the district and the CVET dropout rates for 1978-79 was calculated to be 2.05 which yielded a t value of 2.63 with 51 degrees of freedom. The probability reported by the computer was 0.011. The t was significant below the .05 level.

The 1979-80 district and CVET dropout rates had a mean difference of 2.22, with a calculated t value of 3.28 and 52 degrees of freedom. The computer listed the probability to be 0.002. Thus, the results were found to be significant below the .05 level.

In examining the results for 1980-81 the mean difference of the dropout rates was calculated to be -.14. The t value was found to be -0.20 with 52 degrees of freedom. The probability reported by the computer was 0.842. In this instance, the results were not significant at the .05 level.

The 1981-82 district and CVET dropout rates had a calculated mean difference of 1.62 which yielded a t value of 2.23 with 52 degrees of freedom. The computer listed the probability to be 0.030. The results were found to be significant below the .05 level.

TABLE III
CORRELATED T TEST RESULTS FOR DISTRICT
AND CVET DROPOUT RATES BY YEAR

Year	\bar{X}	D	SD	t	Prob.
1978-79 (N=52)					
District	7.66				
CVET	5.60	2.05	5.60	2.63*	0.011
1979-80 (N=53)					
District	6.59				
CVET	4.37	2.22	4.90	3.28*	0.002
1980-81 (N=53)					
District	6.17				
CVET	6.30	-.14	5.00	-0.20	0.842
1981-82 (N=53)					
District	6.05				
CVET	4.42	1.62	5.30	2.23*	0.030

*Significant at .05 level.

The overall results for the four correlated t tests yielded significant mean differences between the district and CVET dropout rates for three of the four years examined. The mean difference for the district and CVET dropout rates was not significant for 1980-81.

Dropout Patterns

Examination of the dropout patterns exhibited by CVET enrollees was accomplished by tracking tenth grade CVET students exiting from the 53 schools by year. The total number of dropouts as well as the total number of students remaining in school was calculated for each of the schools. In some cases, district dropout information was unavailable and the number of CVET dropouts could not be determined. These data are designated with a plus (+). An asterisk (*) designates the cases in which no tenth grade students were enrolled in CVET and ninth grade students were traced for use in the analysis.

The analysis of variance performed upon tenth grade CVET enrollee data was accomplished by dividing the data into four sections. The first section consisted of tenth grade CVET enrollees dropping out during the tenth grade for each of the four years. The second section included tenth grade CVET students exiting the following year from the eleventh grade. Tenth grade enrollees dropping from the twelfth grade comprised the third section, while the fourth section consisted of the total number of tenth grade CVET students dropping out during the four years examined. For testing purposes, the four years examined in the study were treated as four groups. In some cases, data was not yet available and the number of groups (or years) varied for each section. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was performed upon each of the four sections.

As indicated in Table IV, 892 (75.85 percent) of the 1,176 tenth grade students enrolled in CVET during 1978-79 remained in school. However, a total

TABLE IV
SUMMARY OF DROPOUT PATTERN EXHIBITED BY
TENTH GRADE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN CVET
PROGRAMS 1978-79

School	Tenth Grade Enrolled 1978-79		Dropped 1978-79		Dropped 1979-80		Dropped 1980-81		Total Dropped		Total Remaining in School	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	<hr/>											
1	14	100	2	14.29	3	21.43	1	7.14	6	42.86	8	57.14
2	8	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	12.50	1	12.50	7	87.50
3	16	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	16	100.00
4	23	100	3	13.04	3	13.04	0	0.00	6	26.09	17	73.91
5	14	100	2	14.29	0	0.00	1	7.14	3	21.43	11	78.57
6	9	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	100.00
7	12	100	1	8.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	8.33	11	91.67
8	12	100	1	8.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	8.33	11	91.67
9	14	100	0	0.00	1	7.14	1	7.14	2	14.29	12	85.71
10	12	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	11	91.67
11	19	100	0	0.00	3	15.79	0	0.00	3	15.79	16	84.21
12	13	100	5	38.46	1	7.69	0	0.00	6	46.15	7	53.85
13	19	100	0	0.00	1	5.26	2	10.53	3	15.79	16	84.21
14	9	100	2	22.22	0	0.00	2	22.22	4	44.44	5	55.56
15	13	100	1	7.69	3	23.08	1	7.69	5	38.46	8	61.54
16	6	100	1	16.67	1	16.67	0	0.00	2	33.33	4	66.67
17	12	100	0	0.00	2	16.67	0	0.00	2	16.67	10	83.33
18	16	100	1	6.25	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	6.25	15	93.75
19	13	100	2	15.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	15.38	11	84.62
20	11	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	100.00
21	16	100	1	6.25	1	6.25	0	0.00	2	12.50	14	87.50
22	17	100	2	11.76	2	11.76	3	17.65	7	41.18	10	58.82
23	7	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	28.57	2	28.57	5	71.43
24	17	100	0	0.00	1	5.88	1	5.88	2	11.76	15	88.24
25	18	100	2	11.11	4	22.22	3	16.67	9	50.00	9	50.00
26	15	100	0	0.00	2	13.33	0	0.00	2	13.33	13	86.67
27	12	100	+	+	0	0.00	0	0.00	+	+	+	+
28	27	100	1	3.70	1	3.70	0	0.00	2	7.40	25	92.59
29	19	100	2	10.53	1	5.26	2	10.53	5	26.32	14	73.68
30	11	100	0	0.00	2	18.18	1	9.09	3	27.27	8	72.73
31	8	100	1	12.50	1	12.50	0	0.00	2	25.00	6	75.00
32	53	100	9	16.98	8	15.09	1	1.89	18	33.96	35	66.04
33	25	100	0	0.00	1	4.00	0	0.00	1	4.00	24	96.00
34	13	100	1	7.69	1	7.69	0	0.00	2	15.38	11	84.62
35	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
36	17	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	100.00
37	16	100	1	6.25	2	12.50	0	0.00	3	18.75	13	81.25
38	12	100	1	8.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	8.33	11	91.67
39	12	100	0	0.00	4	33.33	1	8.33	5	41.67	7	58.33
40	27	100	0	0.00	1	3.70	0	0.00	1	3.70	26	96.30

TABLE IV (Continued)

School	Tenth Grade Enrolled 1978-79		Dropped 1978-79		Dropped 1979-80		Dropped 1980-81		Total Dropped		Total Remaining in School	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	41	16	100	0	0.00	1	6.25	2	12.50	3	18.75	13
42	11	100	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	1	9.09	10	90.91
43	36	100	5	13.89	0	0.00	5	13.89	10	27.78	26	72.22
44	14	100	1	7.14	1	7.14	2	14.29	4	28.57	10	71.43
45	40	100	3	7.50	2	5.00	2	5.00	7	17.50	33	82.50
46	18	100	0	0.00	3	16.67	2	11.11	5	27.78	13	72.22
47	19	100	1	5.26	2	10.53	2	10.53	5	26.32	14	73.68
48	15	100	1	6.67	0	0.00	1	6.67	2	13.33	13	86.67
49	19	100	2	10.53	3	15.79	0	0.00	5	26.32	14	73.68
50	13	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	7.69	1	7.69	12	92.31
51	12	100	0	0.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	2	16.67	10	83.33
52	329*	100	31	9.42	48	14.59	31	9.42	110	33.43	219	66.57
53	13	100	0	0.00	1	7.69	0	0.00	1	7.69	12	92.31
Totals	1,176	100	86	7.31	113	9.61	73	6.21	272	23.13	892	75.85

+District dropout information was not reported, CVET dropouts could not be determined.

*Ninth grade students traced, no tenth graders enrolled.

NOTE: Percents were rounded to nearest hundredth.

of 272 (23.13 percent) CVET students dropped out of school.

Data in Table V display the numbers and percentages of tenth grade students enrolled in CVET during 1979-80 dropping out by year. The total number of tenth grade CVET students traced was 793. One hundred fifty-five students or 19.55 percent of the total dropped out of school. However 638 students or 80.45 percent of the total remained in school.

The 1980-81 tenth grade CVET enrollees dropping by year are displayed in Table VI. The total number of tenth grade students traced was 1,147. Two hundred eight students or 18.13 percent of this total dropped out of school. Nine hundred thirty-nine students or 81.87 percent of the total remained in school.

As displayed in Table VII, the number of tenth grade students enrolled in CVET during 1981-82 totaled 801. Forty-six students or 5.74 percent of the total dropped out of school. Seven hundred fifty-five students or 94.26 percent of the total remained in school.

Table VIII listed the data summarizing the totals of tenth grade CVET enrollees dropping out by year and grade. As indicated in the table, complete data were not yet available for some of the years.

A total of 3,917 tenth grade CVET students were enrolled in the 53 schools over the four-year period examined. Two hundred ninety students or 7.40 percent of this total dropped from the tenth grade. Two hundred eighty students or 7.15 percent of this total dropped the following year from the eleventh grade. One hundred eleven students or 17.39 percent of the total students dropped two years later from the twelfth grade. The number of tenth grade enrollees dropping out during the four years examined totaled 681 or 17.39 percent. Three thousand two hundred twenty-four students or 82.31 percent of the total number of tenth grade students enrolled remained in school.

Data included in Table IX display the results of the analysis of variance by

TABLE V
SUMMARY OF DROPOUT PATTERN EXHIBITED BY
TENTH GRADE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN CVET
PROGRAMS 1979-80

School	Tenth Grade Enrolled 1979-80		Dropped 1979-80		Dropped 1980-81		Dropped 1981-82		Total Dropped		Total Remaining in School	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	8	100	0	0.00	3	37.50	0	0.00	3	37.50	5	62.50
2	11	100	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	10	90.91
3	4	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	100.00
4	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
5	11	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	18.18	2	18.18	9	81.82
6	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	14.29	2	14.29	12	85.71
7	11	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	100.00
8	10	100	1	10.0	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	10.00	9	90.00
9	17	100	0	0.00	6	35.29	1	5.88	7	41.18	10	58.82
10	12*	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	11	91.67
11	14	100	0	0.00	3	21.43	2	14.29	5	35.71	9	64.29
12	12	100	4	33.33	3	25.00	0	0.00	7	58.33	5	41.67
13	15	100	0	0.00	2	13.33	1	6.67	3	20.00	12	80.00
14	12	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	12	100.00
15	15	100	1	6.67	0	0.00	1	6.67	2	13.33	13	86.67
16	12	100	0	0.00	1	8.33	0	0.00	1	8.33	11	91.67
17	12	100	0	0.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	2	16.67	10	83.33
18	12	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	11	91.67
19	12	100	1	8.33	1	8.33	1	8.33	3	25.00	9	75.00
20	10	100	1	10.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	2	20.00	8	80.00
21	9	100	0	0.00	2	22.22	1	11.11	3	33.33	6	66.67
22	15	100	2	13.33	0	0.00	1	6.67	3	20.0	12	80.00
23	7	100	0	0.00	1	14.29	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
24	9	100	0	0.00	1	11.11	0	0.00	1	11.11	8	88.89
25	13	100	2	15.38	2	15.38	0	0.00	4	30.77	9	69.23
26	7	100	1	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	14.29	6	85.71
27	16	100	1	6.25	2	12.50	0	0.00	3	18.75	13	81.25
28	21	100	5	23.81	5	23.81	0	0.00	10	47.62	11	52.38
29	19	100	0	0.00	1	5.26	2	10.53	3	15.79	16	84.21
30	12	100	2	16.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	16.67	10	83.33
31	19	100	2	10.53	1	5.26	0	0.00	3	15.79	16	84.21
32	54	100	3	5.56	2	3.70	0	0.00	5	9.26	49	90.74
33	19	100	0	0.00	2	10.53	2	10.53	4	21.05	15	78.95
34	11	100	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	1	9.09	10	90.91
35	18	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	5.56	1	5.56	17	94.44
36	9	100	1	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	11.11	8	88.89
37	12	100	0	0.00	1	8.33	2	16.67	3	25.00	9	75.00
38	8	100	1	12.50	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	12.50	7	87.50
39	6	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	16.67	1	16.67	5	83.33

TABLE V (Continued)

School	Tenth Grade Enrolled 1979-80		Dropped 1979-80		Dropped 1980-81		Dropped 1981-82		Total Dropped		Total Remaining in School	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	40	39	100	1	2.56	1	2.56	0	0.00	2	5.13	37
41	16	100	2	12.50	1	6.25	0	0.00	3	18.75	13	81.25
42	11	100	1	9.09	1	9.09	0	0.00	2	18.18	9	81.82
43	28	100	5	17.86	4	14.29	2	7.14	11	39.29	17	60.71
44	10	100	1	10.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	4	40.00	6	60.00
45	42	100	5	11.90	1	2.38	2	4.76	8	19.05	34	80.95
46	21	100	2	9.52	2	9.54	3	14.29	7	33.33	14	66.67
47	14	100	2	14.29	1	7.14	1	7.14	4	28.57	10	71.43
48	11	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	100.00
49	14	100	0	0.00	2	14.29	2	14.29	4	28.57	10	71.43
50	15	100	0	0.00	1	6.67	1	6.67	2	13.33	13	86.67
51	15	100	2	13.33	2	13.33	0	0.00	4	26.67	11	73.33
52	27	100	6	22.22	2	7.41	1	3.70	9	33.33	18	66.67
53	8	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	12.50	1	12.50	7	87.50
Totals	793	100	56	7.06	61	7.69	38	4.79	155	19.55	638	80.45

*Ninth grade students traced, no tenth graders enrolled.

NOTE: Percents were rounded to nearest hundredth.

TABLE VI
SUMMARY OF DROPOUT PATTERN EXHIBITED BY
TENTH GRADE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN CVET
PROGRAMS 1980-81

School	Tenth Grade Enrolled 1980-81		Dropped 1980-81		Dropped 1981-82		Total Dropped		Total Remaining in School	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	12	100	2	16.67	1	8.33	3	25.00	9	75.00
2	10	100	2	20.00	2	20.00	4	40.00	6	60.00
3	8	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	100.00
4	19	100	0	0.00	1	5.26	1	5.26	18	94.74
5	8	100	1	12.50	2	25.0	3	37.50	5	62.50
6	9	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	100.00
7	13	100	1	7.69	0	0.00	1	7.69	12	92.31
8	9	100	2	22.22	0	0.00	2	22.22	7	77.78
9	17	100	1	5.88	0	0.00	1	5.88	16	94.12
10	3	100	0	0.00	1	33.33	1	33.33	2	66.67
11	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
12	10	100	2	20.00	0	0.00	2	20.00	8	80.00
13	8	100	2	25.00	2	25.00	4	50.00	4	50.00
14	13	100	0	0.00	1	7.69	1	7.69	12	92.31
15	16	100	2	6.25	2	12.50	4	25.00	12	75.00
16	11	100	1	9.09	0	0.00	1	9.09	10	90.91
17	8	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	100.00
18	13	100	2	15.38	0	0.00	2	15.38	11	84.62
19	12	100	1	8.33	0	0.00	1	8.33	11	91.67
20	10	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	100.00
21	10	100	0	0.00	1	10.00	1	10.00	9	90.00
22	14	100	2	14.29	1	7.14	3	21.43	11	78.57
23	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
24	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
25	12	100	2	16.67	0	0.00	2	16.67	10	83.33
26	8	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	100.00
27	12	100	0	0.00	4	33.33	4	33.33	8	66.67
28	16	100	4	25.00	2	12.50	6	37.50	10	62.50
29	10	100	1	10.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	8	80.00
30	11	100	2	18.18	1	9.09	3	27.27	8	72.73
31	20	100	0	0.00	1	5.00	1	5.00	19	95.00
32	74	100	4	5.41	5	6.76	9	12.16	65	87.84
33	31	100	0	0.00	1	3.23	1	3.23	30	96.77
34	4	100	0	0.00	2	50.00	2	50.00	2	50.00
35	6	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	100.00
36	10	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	100.00
37	12	100	3	25.00	0	0.00	3	25.00	9	75.00
38	16	100	0	0.00	1	6.25	1	6.25	15	93.75
39	9	100	0	0.00	1	11.11	1	11.11	8	88.89

TABLE VI (Continued)

School	Tenth Grade Enrolled 1980-81		Dropped 1980-81		Dropped 1981-82		Total Dropped		Total Remaining in School	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
40	22	100	1	4.55	0	0.00	1	4.55	21	95.45
41	16	100	2	12.50	1	6.25	3	18.75	13	81.25
42	11	100	2	18.18	1	9.09	3	27.27	8	72.73
43	32	100	5	15.63	3	9.38	8	25.00	24	75.00
44	13	100	0	0.00	1	7.69	1	7.69	12	92.31
45	38	100	5	13.16	2	5.26	7	18.42	31	81.58
46	5	100	1	20.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
47	11	100	4	36.36	2	18.18	6	54.55	5	45.45
48	13	100	1	7.69	0	0.00	1	7.69	12	92.31
49	14	100	0	0.00	1	7.14	1	7.14	13	92.86
50	16	100	1	6.25	1	6.25	2	12.50	14	87.50
51	9	100	1	11.11	2	22.22	3	33.33	6	66.67
52	412*	100	42	10.19	59	14.32	101	24.51	311	75.47
53	9	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	100.00
Totals	1,147	100	102	8.89	106	9.24	208	18.13	939	81.87

*Ninth grade students traced, no tenth graders enrolled.

NOTE: Percents were rounded to nearest hundredth.

TABLE VII
 SUMMARY OF DROPOUT PATTERN EXHIBITED BY
 TENTH GRADE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN CVET
 PROGRAMS 1981-82

School	Tenth Grade Enrolled 1981-82		Dropped 1981-82		Total Dropped		Total Remaining in School	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	8	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	100.00
2	12	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	12	100.00
3	6	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	100.00
4	13	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	100.00
5	7	100	1	14.29	1	14.29	6	85.71
6	10	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	100.00
7	12	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	12	100.00
8	8	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	100.00
9	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
10	18*	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	18	100.00
11	10	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	100.00
12	12	100	5	41.67	5	41.67	7	58.33
13	14	100	1	7.14	1	7.14	13	92.86
14	10	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	100.00
15	9	100	1	11.11	1	11.11	8	88.89
16	6	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	100.00
17	7	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	100.00
18	15	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	15	100.00
19	17	100	1	5.88	1	5.88	16	94.12
20	13	100	2	15.38	2	15.38	11	84.62
21	12	100	1	8.33	1	8.33	11	91.67
22	14	100	2	14.29	2	14.29	12	85.71
23	15	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	15	100.00
24	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
25	2	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	100.00
26	8	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	100.00
27	15	100	1	6.67	1	6.67	14	93.33
28	24	100	2	8.33	2	8.33	22	91.67
29	13	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	100.00
30	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
31	7	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	100.00
32	104	100	8	7.69	8	7.69	96	92.31
33	14	100	1	7.14	1	7.14	13	92.86
34	8	100	4	50.00	4	50.00	4	50.00
35	17	100	2	11.76	2	11.76	15	88.23
36	8	100	1	12.50	1	12.50	7	87.50
37	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
38	11	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	11	100.00

TABLE VII (Continued)

School	Tenth Grade Enrolled 1981-82		Dropped 1981-82		Total Dropped		Total Remaining in School	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
39	8	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	100.00
40	42	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	42	100.00
41	10	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	100.00
42	9	100	1	11.11	1	11.11	8	88.89
43	32	100	5	15.63	5	15.63	27	84.38
44	9	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	100.00
45	45	100	3	6.67	3	6.67	42	93.33
46	9	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	9	100.00
47	11	100	1	9.09	1	9.09	10	90.91
48	16	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	16	100.00
49	17	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	17	100.00
50	14	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00
51	12	100	1	8.33	1	8.33	11	91.67
52	25	100	2	8.00	2	8.00	23	92.00
53	7	100	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	100.00
Totals	801	100	46	5.74	46	5.74	755	94.26

*Ninth grade students traced, no tenth graders enrolled.

NOTE: Percents were rounded to nearest hundredth.

TABLE VIII
 SUMMARY OF TOTALS FOR TENTH GRADE CVET
 STUDENTS DROPPING OUT BY YEAR
 AND GRADE

Year	Tenth Grade Enrollees		Dropped from Tenth Grade		Dropped from Eleventh Grade		Dropped from Twelfth Grade		Total Dropped		Remained in School	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1978-79	1,176*	100	86	7.31	113	9.61	73	6.21	272	23.13	892	75.85
1979-80	793*	100	56	7.06	61	7.69	38	4.79	155	19.55	638	80.48
1980-81	1,147*	100	102	8.89	106	9.24	+	+	208	18.13	939	81.87
1981-82	801*	100	46	5.74	+	+	+	+	46	5.74	755	94.26
Totals	3,917*	100	290	7.40	280	7.15	111	2.83	681	17.39	3,224	82.31

*Ninth graders were traced if no tenth grade students were enrolled.

+Complete data not yet available.

NOTE: Percents are rounded to nearest hundredth. Totals may not be consistent due to incomplete data.

year and grade from which the student exited. As indicated in Table IX, not one of the findings relating to the one-way between subjects ANOVA yielded significant results at the .05 level.

TABLE IX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TENTH GRADE
CVET DROPOUTS BY YEAR AND GRADE

Tenth Grade CVET Students 1979-82	df	SS	MS	F	Prob.
Dropped from 10th Grade					
Between Groups	3	39.05	13.02	0.90	0.443
Within Groups	207	2,998.37	14.48		
Total	210	2,037.42			
Dropped from 11th Grade*					
Between Groups	2	30.05	15.03	0.41	0.665
Within Groups	156	5,720.87	36.67		
Total	158	5,750.91			
Dropped from 12th Grade*					
Between Groups	1	11.56	11.56	1.22	0.273
Within Groups	104	989.21	9.51		
Total	105	1,000.76			
Total Dropped					
Between Groups	3	534.38	178.13	1.68	0.173
Within Groups	207	21,994.69	106.25		
Total	210	22,529.07			

Note: The four years examined in the study were treated as groups for testing purposes.

*Complete data not yet available for some groups (or years).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concludes the study and offers information presented in three sections: (1) summary, (2) conclusions, and (3) recommendations.

Summary

A primary objective of the Coordinated Vocational Education and Training program is to keep potential dropouts in school. The specific problem dealt with in the study was the effectiveness of the program in preventing student dropouts within Oklahoma. The dual purpose of the study was (1) to determine the effectiveness of CVET programs in preventing student dropouts in the State of Oklahoma and (2) to examine the dropout pattern exhibited by early school leavers.

Both enrollment and dropout data were collected for 53 schools in Oklahoma who implemented CVET programs consecutively over a four-year period beginning with 1978-79 through 1981-82. The number of CVET dropouts were determined by hand matching CVET enrollment data to dropout data for specific years. A district dropout rate, as well as a CVET program dropout rate was calculated for each of the 53 schools. The mean difference between the two rates was tested for significance through utilization of the correlated t test for each of the four years.

The findings relating to the mean difference of the district and CVET dropout rates were significant for three of the four years included in the study.

However, 1980-81 dropout data yielded no significant mean difference between the district and CVET dropout rates. The null hypothesis was rejected for 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1981-82, while the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for 1980-81 data.

In examining the dropout pattern exhibited by early school leavers, tenth grade CVET students were traced for two consecutive years in order to accumulate useful data. The tenth grade CVET enrollees dropping out during the tenth grade as well as two consecutive years later from the eleventh and twelfth grades were noted.

An analysis of variance was utilized to test for significance between the groups. This one-way between subjects ANOVA was performed upon each of the four sections of accumulated dropout information. The first section consisted of tenth grade CVET students dropping out during the tenth grade for each of the four years. The second section included tenth grade CVET students exiting the following year or from the eleventh grade during the four-year period examined. Tenth grade enrollees dropping from the twelfth grade comprised the third section, while the fourth section consisted of the total number of tenth grade CVET students dropping out during 1979-82. The four years examined in the study were treated as groups for testing purposes.

Findings relating to the analysis of variance between the groups indicated that none of the results were significant at the .05 level. Therefore, based upon these findings, the researcher failed to reject the stated null hypotheses.

Conclusions

After reviewing the dropout data and interpreting the results of statistical tests for significance, the following conclusions were developed:

1. As revealed in the findings, the mean of the district dropout rate was

greater than the CVET dropout rate mean for three of the four years examined, while the CVET dropout mean was greater than the district dropout mean for one year. However, due to the assumption that CVET students are potential dropouts, equal or slightly higher dropout rates were considered positive results. In addition, it was found that over the four year period examined in the study, a larger percentage of tenth grade CVET enrollees remained in school rather than dropped out. Thus, it was concluded that the Coordinated Vocational Education and Training program is effectively keeping potential dropouts in school.

2. No specific dropout pattern could be established for tenth grade CVET enrollees. It appears in total numbers, that more tenth grade enrollees drop from the eleventh grade rather than the tenth or twelfth grades. However, partially due to incomplete data, a dropout pattern could not be ascertained. In addition, it must be taken into consideration that there are many complex, multiple and at times indistinguishable factors beyond the scope of this study that may affect dropouts and potential dropouts. Some examples of the factors which may affect dropouts and potential dropouts include the reasons students leave school early and the programs they exit from.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of the study, the following suggestions are recommended for practice and further study:

Practice

1. Additional emphasis should be placed upon collaboration with high

school guidance and counseling programs in conjunction with the operation and future planning for CVET programs.

2. CVET students completing the second year of the program (usually the tenth grade) should receive additional information and opportunities related to future educational options as well as special consideration from the school's counseling services.
3. Consideration of the development of a feeder program designed specifically for CVET completers to be implemented into area vocational-technical schools should be examined.

Further Study

1. Further study should be conducted on the reasons why students enrolled in CVET programs drop out of school.
2. Further study should be conducted to determine why the CVET dropout rate mean exceeds the district dropout rate mean during 1980-81.
3. Further study should be conducted concerning identification of potential dropouts in early junior high school.
4. Further study should be conducted delving into the primary reasons students exit from educational systems.
5. Further study should be conducted delving into the assumption that programs and projects implemented for the special population have significantly reduced the dropout rate as compared proportionally to disadvantaged and handicapped student enrollment.
6. Further study should be conducted comparing the tenth grade CVET dropout rate to the eleventh grade CVET dropout rate to determine the holding power of CVET.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, Len and Allen Phelps. "Teaching Special Needs Students: A New Challenge." Compendium. The Illinois Network of Exemplary Occupational Programs for Handicapped and Disadvantaged Students. Normal, Illinois: Illinois State University. 1979. ED 195 642.
- Altifest, Myra. Editor. Vocational Education for Students with Special Needs. Fort Collins, Colorado: Colorado State University, June, 1975.
- Bottoms, Gene. "Flexibility Is the Key to Growth." Voc Ed, January/February, 1983, pp. 10-11.
- Bottoms, Gene and P. Copa. "A Perspective on Vocational Education Today." Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1983, pp. 348-354.
- Campbell, Robert E. Vocational Guidance in Secondary Education: Results of a National Survey. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, December, 1968.
- Frazier, Don. Coordinated Vocational Education and Training in Oklahoma. Stillwater, Oklahoma: State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, 1980.
- Glaser, Roberta E. and Raymond Kley. Keeping High Risk Students in School. (Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, San Francisco, California, March, 1982.) ED 216 462.
- Greene, Bert. Preventing Student Dropouts. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Griffin, Dean. "A New Partnership Becomes Law." Voc Ed, January/February, 1983, pp. 32-34.
- Lukas, Carol V. Special Needs Populations in Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institution of Education, 1981. ED 211 731.
- Linton, Marigold and Philip S. Gallo, Jr. The Practical Statistician: Simplified Handbook of Statistics. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.
- Martin, Donald L., Jr. Identifying Potential Dropouts: A Research Report. Frankfort, Kentucky: Kentucky State Department of Education, February, 1981. ED 216 304.

- Matthews, Clyde C. "A Follow-Up Study to Determine the Effectiveness of the Coordinated Vocational Education and Training Program in Selected High Schools in Oklahoma." (Unpub. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1976.)
- Minnesota State Department of Education. Secondary School Dropouts. St. Paul, Minnesota, 1981. ED 205 682.
- Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. "Oklahoma Dropout Reports." Stillwater, Oklahoma: Planning Division, 1978-82.
- Rhode Island State Department of Education. Vocational Education Early School Leaver Study, Final Report. Providence, Rhode Island: Bureau of Research and Evaluation, 1978. ED 164 987.
- Rhodes, James A. Vocational Education and Guidance: A System for the Seventies. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Publishing Co., 1970.
- Schreiber, Daniel. Editor. The School Dropout. Project: School Dropouts. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1964.
- Shoemaker, Byrl R. "A Philosophy for Vocational Education" (position paper for Issues and Answers in Vocational Education, Snowmass-Aspen, Colorado, 1975). Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, January, 1976.
- Wacker, Gabrielle Banick. "Vocational Education's Role in Serving Dropouts and Potential Dropouts." The Journal of Vocational Special Needs in Education, Volume 4, No. 1, Fall, 1981, pp. 19-22.
- Weber, James M., Cindy Silvani-Lacey, E. Jane Williams, Patricia Worthy Winkfield, Kevin J. Manning, Karen Okefor and Denie Deniston. A Quantitative Study of Basic Skills and Vocational Education. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, January, 1982. ED 215 174.
- Weisburg, Alan. "What Research Has to Say About Vocational Education and the High Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1983, pp. 355-359.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SCHOOLS

OKLAHOMA SCHOOLS WITH CVET PROGRAMS
IN OPERATION CONSECUTIVELY DURING
1979-1982*

Ada	Locust Grove
Afton	Mangum
Allen	Marlow
Antlers	Morris
Arkoma	Muskogee
Atoka	Newcastle
Blanchard	Ninnekah
Bokoshe	Noble
Broken Bow	Oklahoma City
Byng	Okmulgee
Chandler	Pauls Valley
Checotah	Porter
Chelsea	Prague
Chickasha	Sallisaw
Clayton	Shawnee
Colbert	Silo
Comanche	Smithville
Dewar	Stonewall
Dickson	Sulphur
Fort Towson	Talihina
Hinton	Tulsa
Holdenville	Vanoss
Idabel	Watts
Indianola	Westville
Keota	Wewoka
Konowa	Wright City
Lindsay	

*This is an alphabetical list of the schools included in the study. The schools are not organized in sequence to the school numbers used in the study.

APPENDIX B

DISTRICT AND CVET ENROLLMENT/DROPOUT

RAW DATA

TABLE X
DISTRICT AND CVET ENROLLMENT/DROPOUTS
FOR EACH SCHOOL BY YEAR
RAW DATA

School	1978-79				1979-80				1980-81				1981-82			
	DE	DD	CE	CD	DE	DD	CE	CD	DE	DD	CE	CD	DE	DD	CE	CD
1	316	20	30	3	340	33	25	1	240	25	24	3	316	14	28	0
2	160	22	20	2	136	9	21	1	120	9	23	2	128	16	22	0
3	458	5	30	0	460	5	25	0	443	6	27	1	468	9	20	0
4	146	19	43	4	163	17	32	1	170	6	36	0	176	7	36	3
5	242	15	23	2	252	11	20	0	268	12	16	1	244	13	15	1
6	206	6	27	0	233	8	32	0	232	3	18	0	211	22	17	1
7	394	14	27	2	436	9	26	0	401	13	31	2	418	19	25	0
8	201	20	24	1	196	10	24	1	222	6	22	2	160	0	20	0
9	626	40	27	2	643	31	29	1	678	40	33	1	721	33	31	0
10	438	35	29	0	403	19	12	0	392	19	17	0	394	14	18	0
11	496	18	37	0	468	31	31	1	445	23	23	0	441	28	41	0
12	975	94	25	7	993	100	24	6	893	160	25	9	807	99	29	9
13	182	28	32	1	177	21	27	0	196	24	20	2	189	24	29	1
14	277	19	26	2	256	20	27	0	221	10	24	1	239	4	25	0
15	188	17	26	1	196	12	33	1	169	11	25	4	169	8	26	1
16	393	27	27	1	400	33	25	1	416	40	22	3	410	32	27	1
17	127	6	33	0	124	4	29	0	102	4	18	1	113	6	23	1
18	214	16	31	2	214	17	21	1	219	6	26	2	225	4	22	0
19	132	30	28	3	134	36	25	1	157	36	22	2	155	39	35	5
20	339	19	21	0	328	25	27	2	294	10	24	0	290	7	28	2
21	333	18	32	1	303	16	26	0	310	7	21	0	311	19	22	2
22	399	28	34	2	396	28	32	3	392	40	30	3	354	41	28	3
23	421	25	20	2	411	17	16	0	411	15	27	0	396	5	23	0
24	341	11	23	0	324	6	18	0	312	7	29	0	329	7	28	0

TABLE X (Continued)

School	1978-79				1979-80				1980-81				1981-82			
	DE	DD	CE	CD	DE	DD	CE	CD	DE	DD	CE	CD	DE	DD	CE	CD
25	722	68	33	3	678	79	29	4	644	32	32	2	646	40	18	0
26	187	3	30	0	179	10	22	1	157	0	17	0	168	0	24	0
27	174	+	25	+	180	12	27	1	202	11	24	0	189	13	27	2
28	788	91	60	4	765	85	61	10	762	71	60	7	754	59	37	3
29	473	29	36	4	445	18	34	1	479	8	23	1	429	8	31	0
30	447	25	31	1	423	34	30	2	413	25	26	2	394	11	33	0
31	2,361	424	20	2	2,204	152	36	3	2,155	157	28	0	2,037	145	11	0
32	13,118	1,322	85	15	12,464	1,050	109	9	11,274	829	151	10	10,401	992	287	28
33	1,038	42	32	0	1,222	49	55	0	975	60	45	1	868	94	25	2
34	320	20	30	3	316	16	18	0	347	18	16	1	331	11	20	4
35	193	18	32	0	196	12	29	0	188	9	18	0	180	14	26	3
36	205	19	36	1	203	3	24	2	247	7	21	0	178	12	18	2
37	165	11	28	1	174	6	24	0	159	9	24	3	164	6	29	0
38	169	10	24	3	166	3	24	1	167	0	26	0	171	10	18	0
39	201	8	27	3	187	10	20	0	176	6	18	0	202	7	20	0
40	455	22	78	1	445	11	74	1	484	9	83	1	459	12	88	0
41	741	50	34	3	715	45	34	2	635	20	33	2	637	32	22	0
42	147	8	23	0	142	11	21	1	127	11	22	2	126	8	17	1
43	1,610	118	74	7	1,556	139	60	5	1,459	180	67	6	1,328	140	72	7
44	171	8	29	1	179	14	24	2	196	32	25	2	182	14	19	0
45	412	65	84	8	437	32	83	9	460	42	87	11	449	31	78	6
46	341	55	43	0	306	34	40	5	305	25	15	1	289	15	16	0
47	409	34	34	1	395	50	28	2	359	59	23	5	342	32	26	2
48	250	19	29	1	244	5	24	0	244	6	26	2	257	0	31	0
49	752	38	36	2	776	26	32	0	724	28	31	0	712	40	35	0
50	346	17	25	0	337	6	33	0	319	10	30	1	332	20	30	1
51	456	22	31	0	448	33	28	2	434	24	28	4	422	19	29	1
52	17,662	2,019	374	36	16,206	1,803	360	28	15,086	1,517	444	43	14,158	1,442	418	51

TABLE X (Continued)

School	1978-79				1979-80				1980-81				1981-82			
	DE	DD	CE	CD	DE	DD	CE	CD	DE	DD	CE	CD	DE	DD	CE	CD
53	159	4	25	0	172	4	19	0	173	5	19	1	174	7	11	0
Totals	52,476	5,121	2,123	138	50,146	4,270	2,009	112	47,053	3,742	2,045	147	44,643	3,704	2,134	143

+Dropout information unavailable, CVET dropouts could not be determined.

NOTE: DE - District Enrollment
 DD - District Dropouts
 CE - CVET Enrollment
 CD - CVET Dropouts

VITA²

Verna Gayle Bullard

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: An Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Coordinated Vocational Education and Training Program in Preventing Student Dropouts Within the State of Oklahoma

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Hartshorne, Oklahoma, November 21, 1958, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Bullard.

Education: Graduated from Wilburton High School, Wilburton, Oklahoma, in May, 1976; received Bachelor of Science in Education degree from Southeastern Oklahoma State University in 1980; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in July, 1983.

Professional Experience: Vocal Music Instructor, Rattan Public Schools, 1980-81, Graduate Assistant for State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, 1982-present.

Professional Organizations: Phi Delta Kappa, Oklahoma State University chapter; American Association for Adult and Continuing Education.