AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS TO ENTER MECHANICAL POWER TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA

By

RAY EDMUND SANDERS II

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, 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
May, 1985

AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS TO ENTER MECHANICAL POWER TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The investigator wishes to express his appreciation to the many people who helped make this study possible.

A most sincere appreciation is extended to the investigator's advisory committee for their encouragement, advice, and willingness always to help. The investigator is especially indebted to Dr. Clyde Knight, whose continual encouragement and intelligent guidance made the completion of this thesis possible. A very special thank you is extended to Dr. Jerry Davis and Dr. Craig Anderson for their support.

A special expression of thanks goes to Dr. Cecil Dugger for his help during the last three years.

The investigator would like to thank Kay Porter for her excellent typing efforts on this thesis.

The investigator is grateful to Mr. Vernon Cline of the Carl Albert Junior College Computer Center, for his help and direction in the tabulation of this study.

Eternal gratitude and appreciation is extended to the investigator's wife, Catherine, and his daughter, Emilie. Without their support, constant encouragement, and love this work would not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Technician preparation programs have had to change to keep pace with the rapidly changing technologies and the prospective students that they serve. Arns (1), editor of New Directons for Community Colleges (1980) stated:

> Today's occupational student is not a low-achieving high school graduate who cannot make it in the baccalaureate curriculums. Rather, the majority are dedicated, goal-oriented, no-nonsense individuals who are in occupational courses because they want to be there (p. 8).

There are many reasons that students choose to enter mechanical power technology (MPT) programs in Oklahoma. With a rapidly changing technology and a decreasing number of high school seniors, it has become increasingly important to learn what factors influence students to enter MPT programs.

Statement of Need

Information on why students choose MPT programs is needed to improve student recruitment in MPT programs. Improved student recruitment could increase student MPT enrollments and improve the quality of students entering MPT programs. Increased MPT enrollments are needed so that there will be more MPT graduates entering the MPT industry. As the mechanical power industry grows, more mechanical power technicians are needed to replace the mechanical power technicians who die or retire.

Much money and time is being spent in planning and recruiting students for technician programs. There are scores of counselors employed at the high school and at the post-secondary level who are actively interested in career guidance and counseling. Administrators, department heads, and instructors are constantly striving to embellish their marketing plans and thereby to increase enrollments in MPT programs since enrollments in such programs are on the decrease

Statement of the Problem

To meet the needs of society and to utilize fully the facilities of existing MPT programs, information on what influences students to enroll in MPT programs is needed, such influences may lead to greater MPT program enrollments

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this descriptive study was to analyze the factors which influenced students to enter mechanical power technology programs in Oklahoma. The factors to be analyzed were divided into the following categories: age, sex, race, marital status, role in household, handicapped status, military experience, different institutions, students receiving federal financial aid, student employment/non-employment history immediately preceeding enrollment, and size of community. The factors were predetermined by the investigator and by a related study (2).

Research Questions

Question 1. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings

given by students of different age groups to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 2. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given my males and females to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 3. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by different racial groups to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 4. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by married and unmarried students to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 5. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students who are heads of households and those who are not to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 6. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students who are physically handicapped and those who are not to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 7. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students who have served in the military and those who have not to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 8. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students of different institutions to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 9. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students receiving federal aid and those who are not to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 10. Will the relaitonship be significant among the ratings given by students of different educational backgrounds to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 11. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students of different employment backgrounds to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question 12. Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students from different size communities to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to eroll in MPT programs?

Assumptions

The following assumptions were included in this study.

1. That the questionnaires were completed by the respondents as an honest expression of their opinions.

2. That the items listed on the questionnaire are representative of most of the factors which do influence students to choose MPT programs.

Scope and Limitations

This study was limited by three major components.

1. This study was limited to first year students entering MPT programs in August/September, 1984.

2. This study was limited to mechanical power technology programs in junior colleges and technical institutions.

3. Mechanical power technology was used broadly to include only those programs involved in the automotive industry that attempted to prepare students for employment as a semi-professional. Instruction normally involves subjects of a technical nature, such as mathematics, physical sciences, materials, and processes. The following programs were included: (1) Auto Service Management - 1 total; (2) Auto-mechanical - 6 total.

Definitions

The following definitions were used in this study.

Technical Education is planned instruction that will prepare for a variety of occupations requiring skills of a semi-professional nature. Instruction normally involves subjects of a technical nature such as mathematics, the physical and life sciences, and materials and processes related to the specific requirements of the job (3).

Mechanical Power Technology (MPT) Programs are programs which are technical in nature as is related to the automotive industry. Such programs prepare the student for employment as a semi-professional. Most programs offer an associate degree.

Technical Institute is a post-high school institution offering

training for occupations in which emphasis is placed on the application of the functional aspects of mathematics and science, or an officially designated, separately organized technical institute divisions of a four-year institution (4).

Junior College is an institution of higher education which usually offers the first two years of college instruction which grants an associate degree and which does not grant a bachelors degree. It is either an independently organized institution (public or non-public) or an institution which is a part of a public school system or an independently organized system of junior colleges. Offerings include college transfer programs and programs in technical education as well as continuing education for adults (3).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature was conducted with the intent of determining which factors most influenced students to enter specific colleges and programs. It was instrumental in helping the investigator formulate items to include in the study. It was also helpful in outlining some important objectives and questions for the study. This chapter reveals several aspects of the influences of students' programs and college choices.

Influential People

Cobb and Cardozin (6) reported in a study of ninth and twelfth grade students in regular high schools in Maryland that the students themselves ranked first in influencing their choice of curriculum. Stordahl (7) found similar results in a study of college freshmen at Northern Michigan University. The study concluded that students, in general, thought that the advice of others had relatively little influence on their decisions to attend Northern Michigan University. Another study conducted in Oklahoma found that no one had as great an influence on the decisions of educational choices as the student himself (2).

Most studies, however, indicated that other people--especially parents--greatly influenced educational choice. Parents were rated as the most influential factor in the decision a student made about college

choice in a study of college-bound high school seniors from 14 schools in Utah (8). Noeth, Engen, and Noeth (9) used a random sample (N=12,000) of all students who completed the Washington Pre-college Test to determine who helped the most in making college and career decisions. The results revealed that students' families were perceived to be one of the most helpful--second only to interesting classes.

Graham (10) conducted a study of freshmen who were enrolled at Oklahoma State University and had majored in agriculture to ascertain who the people were that influenced the students' choices of the major and which sources of information had the most influence on the choice. Graham (10, p. 38) found that, ". . . without question, parents are the ones who exert the greatest amount of influence on their childrens' decisions on where to attend college and what to major in." Similar results were found by Stahmann, Hanson, and Whittlesey (11). The advice of parents or other family members was the most influential factor on college choice. This study sampled high school seniors who had indicated plans to attend college and who were from a medium size (45,000) Iowa community.

Maguire (12) reported that freshmen respondents rated contact with enrolled Western Illinois University students higher than that with parents, university counselors, friends and relatives, alumni, and high school counselors in a study conducted to determine the degree of influence factors had on students' decisions to enroll at Western Illinois University. In other studies conducted at individual institutions, freshmen students indicated that the comments and college choices of their friends were most important in influencing their own college decision (12).

Menacker (14), University of Illinois associate director of admissions and records, found that the most influential people in deciding what college to choose were (in order): (1) parents, (2) brothers and sisters, (3) friends in high school, (4) friends already attending college, (5) high school counselor, (6) other relatives, (7) high school teachers, and (8) college recruiter.

A survey of 8,000 students who took the American College Test (ACT) on what influences a student's choice of college revealed that advice from high school counselors or college consultants and talks with admission counselors were rated as very low influences by both men and women (15). Graham's (10) study also found that counselors, high school principals, and high school teachers had little effect in influencing a student's decision to enter a certain program or to enter a particular college. The Washington (9) study concluded that counselors and out-of-school activities were viewed as being the least helpful in making educational decisions. Data in the Brooks (2) study revealed that high school guidance counselors and high school principals had almost no influence on the students' choices to enroll in particular programs. However, Rowe (8) concluded that counselors, although not as influential as other factors, did have an impact on the decisions of students to enter specific programs and colleges.

Sources of Information

Under the written materials heading, Maguire (12) reported that Western Illinois freshmen rated the department brochure highest on the scale of influence on the decision to matriculate. Impressions from the undergraduate catalog was rated as an important information source.

Newspaper and magazine articles rated lower than materials supplied by the institution. Financial aid literature was rated as very important.

Menacker (14) and Stahmann, Hanson, and Whittlesey (11) concluded that the most influential sources of information regarding the decision to attend colleges were a visit to a college campus and talking to college students rather than printed descriptive and recruitment materials.

One study conducted by Chapman and Johnson (16) of interviewed freshmen at a state university in Indiana, found that students had indicated that they did not select a college based on reading its printed material. Rather, they read the printed materials basically to confirm decisions that they had already made before reading the materials.

Chapman (13) states:

> In addition, students in the upper third of college entrance examination scores are apt to receive materials from 50 to 75 colleges. Students report they do not know how to process or evaluate that much information. Much of it ends up in the wastebasket, unread (p. 501).

Erdmann (17) conducted a survey of 500 students designed to measure the relative importance of three factors: (1) why do students read unsolicited mailings, (2) what are the factors which influenced student choice in selecting colleges to which to apply, and (3) what are the factors which determine a "first choice" college for students. Students ranked the reputation of the institution which sent the unsolicited mailing as the most important determinant on whether the piece was read. The second most important factor was the location of the institution, and the third factor was the use of the student's personal name in the material. The least important factor was the design of the piece.

According to a Utah study, students generally agreed that the best time for colleges to present materials was from September to October of the senior year (8). There were relatively few students who indicated that the best time to receive information from colleges was in the junior year.

Information about the college recruiting visit to the secondary school during the first five months of 1981 was collected by Dalton (18). Admission directors, secondary school counselors, and college bound seniors from 76 colleges--38 from the Mid-Atlantic and 38 from New England--responded to a survey which measured the extent, purpose, and value of the visit. It was found that the college's most important objective in the visit was communication. Fifty-one percent of the students say the visit as having more influence on applications to colleges than either mailed materials or information fairs.

Graham (10) reported that visits to the college campus, materials printed about the college, and handbooks had a moderate influence on students' choices of a college and a major. Brooks (2) also reported the brochure as having a moderate influence on matriculation.

Other Factors

Erdmann (17) found that the availability of specific academic programs was the most important factor in the selection of a college. The reputation of the institution ranked second and the location of the institution ranked third. The least important factor in influencing student choice of a college, as ranked by students, was alumni contact.

Rowe (8) purports that the availability of academic programs and the availability of financial aid were the most important factors in

the selection of a college. Rowe (8, p. 7) also said that job placement was an important factor, "suggesting the increasingly important role students are assigning to colleges as career development institutions."

Menacker (14) also found that the reputation of the institution was an important factor for selecting a university. The most effective was to live at home and save money, followed by the institution's reputation, and to remain with family (in that order).

Cost and financing a college education have become important factors in deciding whether to go to college and for deciding which school to attend. Maguire (12) stated:

> In the present economic situation, cost becomes a growing consideration for prospective students. Tuition, scholarships and grants are topics for the student to consider when deciding which school to attend (p. 9).

In the "other" category of Maguire's two-year study of Western Illinois University students, student's perception of low tuition was rated as a very important factor in choosing a college by 32.3 percent of the respondents. Twenty-three percent gave a very important rating to low room and board rates as a factor in influencing decisions to enter the university. Twenty-nine percent said that the availability of financial aid was very important. This was higher than the rating given for the actual awarding of financial aid which was 24 percent. Student employment was given a moderate rating.

Tillery and Kildegaard (19) suggest that cost is most likely an influence on whether the student goes to college rather than on which specific college he enters. Mundy (20) seems to support Tillery and Kildegaard's study. Family income seems to dictate where a student

attends college; however, Tillery and Kildegaard (19) report a surprising lack of relationship between family income and the cost of the specific college attended.

Davis and VanDusen (21) found that cost was one of the most important influences in the student's decisions not to attend a particular institution or college that they preferred. Ihlanfeldt (22) estimated that at least 70 percent of all college students rely on financial assistance and that a large number of the students would be severely restricted in college choice without financial aid.

Super (23) states that students enter colleges to increase their skills and thus to move up the "social ladder". He found this was particularly true for technical occupations. Education is the means for occupational and social mobility in technical occupations.

In a study at Flint Community Junior College (24), it was found that freshmen students preferred a significantly higher occupational level than the occupational level actually held by their fathers. In another study at a public junior college in Texas (25), there were again indications that one of the major reasons for attending college was to attain upward social mobility.

Trent and Medsker (26) studied 10,000 high school graduates from 16 communities throughout the Midwest, California, and Pennsylvania to determine influence on college choice. They found that socioeconomic status had more influence on college choice than academic ability. This influence did not rank as high with women as it did with men.

Young adults from upper socioeconomic groups were more likely to go to college--even though they may have achieved relatively poorly in high school--than were young people from the lower socioeconomic groups.

This was likely due to both a greater expectation level and a greater economic opportunity for young adults to go to college in upper socio-economic families, according to Stordahl (7).

Stordahl (7) also reports that freshmen whose homes were near a university claimed that the more practical considerations of cost and location of the university were stronger in their decisions to enter the university. Students whose homes were farther from the university did not rank practical concerns as high as those who lived closer to the university.

Ihlanfeldt (22) reports that over 50 percent of entering freshmen attended colleges within 50 miles of their home, and 92 percent attended college within 500 miles of their home. Proximity to home was influenced by the number of educational alternatives in the geographical area. Prospective students in an area with many colleges were not as likely to travel as far to attend college as prospective students in a rural area without many colleges. Student geographical mobility was affected further by academic ability and by their family financial strength. High ability students with no financial need were more likely to consider a wider range of colleges than those less able students who needed financial aid. Low need, high ability students were the most mobile in choosing a college (22).

Summary

The review of literature generally agreed that parents had the greatest influence on students' decisions to enter a college or university. However, three different studies found that the students, themselves had the greatest influence or that no one had the greatest

influence on their college decisions. Currently enrolled college students and friends also had a great influence on prospective students' decisions to enroll in a college.

Most of the literature reports that counselors and high school principals were perceived as the least important factor in the influence of a college choice or program major. Rowe (8) did find, however, a moderate amount of influence by counselors on the college choice decision.

The literature generally agreed that materials printed by the institution, such as brochures and handbooks, were very important in the prospective student's choice of a college and a major. Visits to the college campus were one of the most important sources of information. Newspaper and magazine articles about the college ranked as the least influential source of information on the students' decision to enter a college.

Printed materials were most often read by prospective students if the sponsoring institution were perceived as having a good reputation and by the location of the institution. The usage of the prospective student's name in the printed material was also important.

The availability of financial aid and specific academic programs was a very influential factor in the selection of a college. Cost, location, and the degree for upward social mobility were also influences in the students' decision to choose a college.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to analyze the factors which influenced students to enter mechanical power technology programs in Oklahoma. The means used to accomplish this task are described in this chapter.

The Population

The population consisted of 195 students enrolled in seven MPT programs from seven different institutions. The students were entering freshmen or the equivalent. The department heads were telephoned in advance to seek permission for and to inform them of this study. The questionnaires were distributed in August/September 1984 by the department heads. The completed questionnaires were then returned to the researcher by mail. A copy of the cover letter is found in Appendix B.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed in two parts: (1) an inventory of student personal data needed to answer the research questions, and (2) a list of factors to be rated by the students according to the amount of importance they had in influencing the students to enroll in MPT programs.

The questions on the student data portion (part one) of the questionnaire were formulated by the investigator and by a related study (2). There were revisions made. The questions in final form were checked by experts in the field of research.

The questions on part one of the questionnaire were designed to furnish the individual data needed to divide the population into subgroups to test the 12 research questions. The population was divided into the following categories: (1) age, (2) sex, (3) race, (4) marital status, (5) head of household status, (6) physically handicapped status, (7) veteran or non-veteran, (8) the schools or institutions, (9) federal financial aid status, (10) educational background, (11) employment background, and (12) size of communities.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of a list of factors which influence students to enter colleges and institutions. This list was composed of items found to be pertinent by the investigator and by other studies (2). The five-point continuum scale was used to indicate how influential each factor was to the student. The most important position on the scale had a weight of one, and the least important position had a weight of five. The consensus index or average degree of influence for each of the factors was determined for the entire population and the various groups by the following method: the numerical weights of each factor as rated by the students were summed and then divided by the number of students in the group. When the consensus indices had been calculated for each group's rating of the factors, the investigator ranked the factors according to the consensus indices. The lower the consensus index, the higher the hierarchical assignment given in the rating of the importance of influence the factor had on

the students' decisions.

The questionnaire was pre-tested for clarity by a group of graduate students at Oklahoma State University. The questionnaire was validated by the investigator's committee members.

Statistical Method

The data were subjected to the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation method to determine if the relationship was significant among the groups listed in the research questions.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, according to Popham (27), is a parametric test used to quantify the nature of relationships between two or more variables.

The correlation-computation procedures described by Popham (27) are as follows:

> One basic formula used in the calculation of the product-moment correlation coefficient is--
>
> $$r_{xy} = \frac{xy}{ns_x s_y} \qquad (6.1)$$
>
> where r_{xy} = correlation coefficient between x and y
> xy = sum of cross products of deviation scores for x and y
> s_x and s_y = standard deviations of x and y scores
> n = number of pairs
>
> The basic formula can be manipulated algebraically to result in the following raw-score formula (6.2) which uses original measurements. This formula is easiest to compute on an automatic calculator.
>
> $$r = \frac{\Sigma XY - \frac{(\Sigma X)(\Sigma Y)}{n}}{\sqrt{\left(\Sigma X^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X)^2}{n}\right)\left(\Sigma Y^2 - \frac{(\Sigma Y)^2}{n}\right)}} \qquad (6.2)$$
>
> (p. 84).

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, R, was calculated using the criteria above. These computations were conducted by computer at the College Computer Center, Carl Albert Junior College. The .01 level was used to determine the degree of relationships between the groups listed in the research questions.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to analyze the factors which influenced students to enter mechanical power technology program in Oklahoma. Results of the analysis of data are presented in this chapter. Chapter V is devoted to the summary, conclusions, and recommendations based on this chapter.

The total population consisted of 195 students who had enrolled in one of seven different MPT programs in Oklahoma during the fall semester of 1984. Of this total population, there were six questionnaires improperly completed. This left 189, or 97 percent, of the total population for which a completed response was obtained.

Because of roundings-off, some of the tabulations in this chapter did not add up to 100 percent. Many of the various tables which depicted the rankings of the factors by the different groups contained some ties because of the relatively small number of some groups.

Presentations of Findings

The entire population was divided into groups according to age, sex, race, marital status, head of household status, physically handicapped status, veteran or non-veteran, the seven different institutions

or schools, federal financial aid status, educational background, employment background, and size of the community. For each group a consensus index was computed on each of the 25 factors on part two of the questionnaire. Using the consensus index of each factor, an order ranking was given to the factors. They were ranked according to their rated importance in ascending order. The relationship among the groups was tested for significance, using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation method. This enabled the researcher to determine if any groups rated the factors differently. The mean ratings and the assigned rankings of the factors for the composite group are shown in Table I.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to determining whether the relationship was significant among the groups listed in the research questions. A summary and general description of the results were presented at the end of the chapter.

Research Question Number One

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students of different age groups to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Question item number one on the questionnaire divided the population into six age groups: 18 to 22, 23 to 27, 28 to 32, 33 to 37, 38 to 42, and over 42. Table II shows the rankings of the factors according to age.

When the Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.731 was significant at the .01 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the six age groups with regard to factors influencing their decisions to enroll in

TABLE I

THE COMPOSITE GROUP'S AVERAGE RANKING OF THE TWENTY-FIVE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS TO ENROLL IN MECHANICAL POWER TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Factors Ranked in Descending Order of Importance	Consensus Index	Ranking
Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	2.18	1
Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	2.27	2
Rate of pay in mechanics	2.33	3
Previous work experience in mechanics	2.36	4
Job security in the mechanical field	2.38	5
Desirable working conditions in mechanics	2.62	6
Reputation of this program	2.89	7
Parents or guardians	3.12	8
Result of occupational test scores	3.44	9
Previous vocational high school courses	3.56	10
Location of this program	3.70	11
Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	3.71	12
High school teacher	3.75	13
Scholarship(s) awarded	3.80	14
Other reasons please list	3.81	15
Brochures about this program	3.83	16
Students who have graduated from this program	3.98	17
Less money required to attend this program	4.11	18
High school guidance counselor	4.15	19
High school friends just entering this program	4.22	20
Other students already enrolled in this program	4.26	21
Newspaper articles about this program	4.32	22
Could not major in the field of my first choice	4.38	23
High school principal	4.44	24
Friends employed in the mechanical field	4.50	25

The composite group consists of all the groups listed in the research questions.

TABLE II

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS OF VARIOUS AGE GROUPS TO ENROLL IN MPT PROGRAMS

Factors	Rankings by Age Groups					
	18-22 n=125	23-27 n=24	28-32 n=20	33-37 n=5	38-42 n=7	over42 n=8
1. High school guidance counselor	20	14	20	8	11	12
2. High school principal	25	18	20	8	11	12
3. High school teacher	11	12	17	7	14	11
4. High school friends just entering the program	21	16	21	8	14	12
5. Other students already enrolled in this program	22	17	16	8	14	8
6. Students who have graduated from this program	18	14	18	8	8	7
7. Friends employed in the mechanical field	9	7	6	8	3	6
8. Parents or guardians	8	10	10	5	10	9
9. Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	12	15	9	6	11	10
10. Previous high school vocational courses	10	11	13	8	14	10
11. Previous work experience in mechanics	3	4	7	3	1	1
12. Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	1	3	5	5	3	7
13. Rate of pay in mechanics	2	6	4	3	2	3
14. Desirable working conditions in mechanics	6	5	3	2	7	5
15. Job security in the mechanical field	5	2	2	4	5	2
16. Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	4	1	1	4	3	4
17. Result of occupational scores	15	8	12	4	4	8
18. Scholarship(s) awarded	13	13	11	8	11	10
19. Less money required to attend this program	19	17	15	8	13	9
20. Could not major in the field of my first choice	23	13	19	8	11	11
21. Location of this program	17	14	8	5	1	2
22. Newspaper articles about this program	24	15	14	8	14	7
23. Brochures about this program	14	9	15	8	12	8
24. Reputation of this program	7	7	11	1	4	2
25. Other reasons - please list	16	12	18	6	6	8

Degrees of Freedom = 24 Correlation Coefficient = 0.731

MPT programs.

Research Question Number Two

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by males and females to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT programs?

Item number three on the questionnaire, which allowed the respondent to indicate his sex, was used to divide the population into males and females. Of the usable questionnaires, 179 respondents were male and 10 were female. The factor ratings were sorted into the two categories, and the consensus index was computed for each of the factors for the two groups. The factors were then ranked, and the statistical test was run. Table III shows the results of the mean ratings of the factors according to males and females.

When the Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.754 was significant at the ,01 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among males and females with regard to factors influencing their decisions to enroll in MPT programs.

Research Question Number Three

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by different racial groups to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enroll in MPT progams?

Item number two on the questionnaire, which allowed the respondents to indicate their race, was used to divide the population into Indians, Blacks, Whites, Mexican Americans and Others. Each group's factor ratings were computed to give a consensus index for each factor. The

TABLE III

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT SEX TO ENROLL IN MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Sex	
		Male n=179	Female n=10
1.	High school guidance counselor	20	8
2.	High school principal	25	13
3.	High school teacher	12	13
4.	High school friends just entering the program	21	15
5.	Other students already enrolled in this program	22	11
6.	Students who have graduated from this program	18	9
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	9	3
8.	Parents or guardians	8	6
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	14	15
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	11	9
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	4	1
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	1	4
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	3	4
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	6	4
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	5	3
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	2	7
17.	Result of occupational test scores	10	10
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	15	12
19.	Less money required to attend this program	19	16
20.	Could not major in the field of my first field	24	18
21.	Location of this program	13	3
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	23	17
23.	Brochures about this program	16	14
24.	Reputation of this program	7	2
25.	Other reasons - please list	17	5

Degrees of Freedom = 24 Correlation Coefficient = 0.754

factors were then ranked by groups, and the statistical test was run. Table IV shows the results of the rankings of factors by the racial groups.

When the Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.649 was significant at the .01 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the racial groups with regard to factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Research Question Number Four

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by married and unmarried students to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enter MPT programs?

Item number four on the questionnaire allowed the respondents to indicate their martial status. The respondents were divided into four categories: single, married, divorced, and widowed. There were no respondents who indicated that they were widowed. The mean factor ratings were computed for each of the factors for the three groups. The factors were then ranked for the groups, and the statistical test was performed. Table V shows the rankings according to marital status.

The calculated value of 0.850 was significant at the .01 level when the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was tested for significance. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the married and unmarried groups with regard to factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Research Question Number Five

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students who are heads of households and those

TABLE IV

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS OF VARIOUS RACIAL GROUPS TO ENROLL IN MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Racial Groups				
		Indian n=24	Black n=15	White n=146	Mexican-American n=2	Other n=2
1.	High school guidance counselor	13	12	21	7	5
2.	High school principal	16	17	23	7	5
3.	High school teacher	10	14	15	7	5
4.	High school friends just entering the program	17	15	20	7	6
5.	Other students already enrolled in this program	11	13	22	7	6
6.	Students who have graduated from this program	14	16	18	7	6
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	8	9	8	6	3
8.	Parents or guardians	7	7	9	7	1
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	10	5	16	7	3
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	9	11	11	7	3
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	1	8	5	3	1
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	1	3	1	2	1
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	2	4	3	2	6
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	4	5	6	3	5
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	3	1	4	4	5
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	5	2	2	1	2
17.	Results of occupational test scores	12	6	10	4	1
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	19	10	13	7	5
19.	Less money required to attend this program	15	11	19	7	4
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	17	14	24	7	5
21.	Location of this program	10	7	14	5	7
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	18	11	24	7	7
23.	Brochures about this program	10	10	17	7	7
24.	Reputation of this program	6	7	7	7	5
25.	Other reasons - please list	19	13	12	7	7

Degrees of Freedom = 24 Correlation Coefficient = 0.649

TABLE V

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED MARRIED AND NOT MARRIED STUDENTS TO ENROLL IN MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Groups		
		Single n=131	Married n=47	Divorced n=11
1.	High school guidance counselor	20	22	13
2.	High school principal	25	24	13
3.	High school teacher	11	17	11
4.	High school friends just entering the program	21	23	13
5.	Other students already enrolled in this program	22	18	13
6.	Students who have graduated from this program	18	15	13
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	10	7	6
8.	Parents or guardians	9	12	8
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	13	14	12
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	5	16	12
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	2	4	6
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	1	5	2
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	3	3	4
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	7	6	3
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	6	1	4
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	4	2	1
17.	Result of occupational test scores	12	10	7
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	14	15	9
19.	Less money required to attend this program	19	19	10
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	23	21	13
21.	Location of this program	16	9	5
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	24	20	12
23.	Brochures about this program	15	13	10
24.	Reputation of this program	8	8	7
25.	Other reasons - please list	17	11	8

Degrees of Freedom = 24 Correlation Coefficient = 0.850

who are not to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enter MPT programs?

Item number five on the questionnaire divided the population into two categories: heads of households and non-heads of households. The factor ratings were sorted into those two groups, and the consensus index was computed for each of the factors for the two groups. The factors were then ranked for the groups, and the statistical test was performed. Table VI shows the results of the rankings.

When the Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.840 was significant at the .01 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the heads of households and non-heads of households and their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Research Question Number Six

Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students who are physically handicapped and those who are not to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enter MPT programs?

Item number six on the questionnaire which allowed the respondents to indicate whether they were physically handicapped was used to divide the population into two groups: handicapped and non-handicapped. Both group's factor ratings were computed to give a consensus index for each factor. The factors were then ranked, and the statistical test was run. Table VII shows the results of the groups' rankings of the factors.

When the Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.893 was significant at the .01 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the two groups

TABLE VI

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD STATUS TO ENTER MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Groups	
		Heads of Households n=79	Non-Heads of Households n=110
1.	High school guidance counselor	22	19
2.	High school principal	24	22
3.	High school teacher	14	13
4.	High school friends just entering the program	23	20
5.	Other students already enrolled in the program	18	21
6.	Students who have already graduated from this program	16	17
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	7	8
8.	Parents or guardians	11	7
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	13	12
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	15	9
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	3	3
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	5	1
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	4	2
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	6	5
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	2	4
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	1	2
17.	Result of occupational test scores	10	10
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	17	13
19.	Less money required to attend this program	19	18
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	21	11
21.	Location of this program	9	15
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	20	11
23.	Brochures about this program	13	14
24.	Reputation of this program	8	6
25.	Other reasons - please list	12	16

Degrees of Freedom = 24 Correlation Coefficient = 0.840

TABLE VII

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED STATUS TO ENTER MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Groups	
		Physically Handicapped n=13	Not Physically Handicapped n=176
1.	High school guidance counselor	12	20
2.	High school principal	14	25
3.	High school teacher	10	14
4.	High school friends just entering the program	13	22
5.	Other students already enrolled in the program	10	21
6.	Students who have already graduated from this program	8	18
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	5	9
8.	Parents or guardians	7	8
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	11	13
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	7	11
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	2	5
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	3	1
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	4	4
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	6	3
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	1	6
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	3	2
17.	Result of occupational test scores	6	10
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	10	15
19.	Less money required to attend this program	12	19
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	11	24
21.	Location of this program	8	12
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	13	23
23.	Brochures about this program	8	17
24.	Reputation of this program	2	7
25.	Other reasons - please list	9	16

Degrees of Freedom = 24 Correlation Coefficient = 0.893

with regard to factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Research Question Number Seven

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students who have served in the military and those who have not to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enter MPT programs?

Item number seven and eight on the questionnaire were used to divide the population into two groups: those who had served in the military and those who had not. The factor ratings were sorted and into the two groups, and the consensus index was computed for each of the factors for the two groups. The factors were then ranked for the groups, and the statistical test was performed. Table VIII shows the results of the rankings for the two groups.

When the Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.856 was significant at the .01 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the students who had served in the military and those who have not with regard to the factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Research Question Number Eight

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students of different institutions to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enter MPT programs?

The questionnaires were sent to seven different institutions in Oklahoma which met the requirements of this study. A school code, which was located in the upper,right hand portion of the questionnaire, was used to divide the population into seven school groups: TJ=Tulsa

TABLE VIII

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS WHO HAVE BEEN IN THE MILITARY AND THOSE WHO HAVE NOT TO ENROLL IN MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Groups	
		Served in the Military n=38	Have Not Served in the Military n=151
1.	High school guidance counselor	21	19
2.	High school principal	22	24
3.	High school teacher	18	12
4.	High school friends just entering the program	23	20
5.	Other students already enrolled in the program	19	21
6.	Students who have already graduated from this program	13	18
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	7	9
8.	Parents or guardians	11	8
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	12	13
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	15	10
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	3	4
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	4	1
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	1	3
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	5	6
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	2	3
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	2	2
17.	Result of occupational test scores	10	11
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	17	14
19.	Less money required to attend this program	20	18
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	17	22
21.	Location of this program	9	15
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	16	23
23.	Brochures about this program	14	16
24.	Reputation of this program	6	8
25.	Other reasons - please list	8	17

Degrees of Freedom = 24 Correlation Coefficient = 0.856

Junior College, OP=Oklahoma State Panhandle University, OS=Oklahoma State Tech, OC=Oklahoma City Junior College, NE=Northeastern A and M, CA=Carl Albert Junior College, and EO=Eastern Oklahoma State College. The factor ratings were sorted into these groups, and the consensus index was computed for each of the factors for the seven groups. The factors were then ranked for the groups, and the statistical test was performed. The results of the rankings for the different institutions are shown in Table IX.

When the Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.618 was significant at the .01 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the students of the seven different institutions with regard to the factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Research Question Number Nine

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students receiving federal aid and those who are not to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enter MPT programs?

Item number nine on the questionnaire divided the population into two groups: those receiving federal aid and those who are not receiving federal financial aid. The factor ratings were sorted into these two groups, and the consensus index was computed for each of the factors for the two groups. The factors were then ranked for the groups, and the statistical test was run. Table X shows the results of the rankings.

When the Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.950 was significant at the .01 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the groups

TABLE IX

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS OF THE VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS TO ENTER MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Groups						
		Tulsa Junior College n=7	Okla Panhandle St. Univ. n=7	Okla. State Tech. n=92	Okla. City Com. Col. n=34	North Eastern A & M n=24	Carl Albert Jun. Col. n=15	Eastern Okla. St.Univ. n=10
1.	High school guidance counselor	9	9	20	18	17	13	15
2.	High school principal	9	9	23	20	23	14	16
3.	High school teacher	6	5	13	17	14	12	8
4.	High school friends just entering the program	10	9	21	18	17	16	14
5.	Other students already enrolled in the program	7	8	22	19	22	15	12
6.	Students who have already graduated from this program	11	5	16	17	21	9	12
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	2	5	9	6	10	7	2
8.	Parents or guardians	7	3	8	9	9	8	6
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	9	4	11	14	18	12	7
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	9	5	10	13	11	10	10
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	4	2	5	4	2	1	2
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	2	8	1	5	1	9	1
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	3	9	2	3	3	5	4
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	2	8	7	3	6	4	3
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	1	9	4	2	5	3	5
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	1	7	3	1	4	6	1
17.	Result of occupational test scores	10	8	12	7	7	7	11
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	10	10	15	11	11	11	13
19.	Less money required to attend this program	12	10	19	13	16	15	15
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	8	8	25	14	15	18	17
21.	Location of this program	5	6	18	8	12	4	9
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	8	10	24	16	20	17	14
23.	Brochures about this program	8	8	14	15	13	15	10
24.	Reputation of this program	6	6	6	10	8	2	9
25.	Other reasons - please list	11	1	17	12	19	10	12

Degrees of Freedom = 24 Correlation Coefficient = 0.618

TABLE X

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS WHO ARE RECEIVING FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID AND THOSE WHO ARE NOT TO ENTER MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Groups: Receiving Federal Financial Aid n=95	Rankings by Groups: Not Receiving Federal Financial Aid n=94
1.	High school guidance counselor	19	23
2.	High school principal	24	25
3.	High school teacher	12	14
4.	High school friends just entering the program	21	21
5.	Other students already enrolled in the program	20	24
6.	Students who have already graduated from this program	18	18
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	8	8
8.	Parents or guardians	7	7
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	11	15
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	9	11
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	5	3
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	1	1
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	2	4
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	5	6
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	4	5
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	3	2
17.	Result of occupational test scores	14	10
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	13	16
19.	Less money required to attend this program	17	19
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	23	20
21.	Location of this program	10	13
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	22	22
23.	Brochures about this program	16	12
24.	Reputation of this program	6	9
25.	Other reasons - please list	15	17

Degrees of Freedom = 24 Correlation Coefficient = 0.950

receiving federal aid and those who are not with regard to factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Research Question Number Ten

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings give by students of different educational backgrounds to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enter MPT programs?

Item number 10 on the questionnaire was used to divide the population into nine categories: how many years of school did the student complete before entering the program--eight or less, nine, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 or more. The factor ratings were sorted into these groups, and the consensus index was computed for each of the facotrs for the nine groups. The factors were then ranked and the statistical test was performed. The results of the rankings are shown in Table XI.

When the Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.697 was significant at the .001 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the different educational background groups with regard to the factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Research Question Number Eleven

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students of different employment backgrounds to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enter MPT programs?

Item number 11 on the questionnaire was used to divide the population into five categories: what the students were doing before they entered the program--school, military, unemployed, employed full-time,

TABLE XI

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS TO ENTER MPT PROGRAMS

Factors	Rankings by Groups Years of Previous Education								
	8 or less n=8	9 n=5	10 n=10	11 n=14	12 n=119	13 n=14	14 n=9	15 n=5	16 or more n=5
1. High school guidance counselor	13	12	13	15	20	15	8	8	8
2. High school principal	14	13	18	12	25	16	15	6	8
3. High school teacher	13	11	12	15	13	10	6	6	4
4. High school friends just entering the program	15	12	14	16	21	13	12	8	8
5. Other students already enrolled in the program	10	12	16	12	23	13	11	8	8
6. Students who have already graduated from this program	6	13	10	11	18	11	9	6	9
7. Friends employed in the mechanical field	1	4	8	6	9	6	5	5	8
8. Parents or guardians	7	4	7	7	8	6	7	4	4
9. Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	11	6	11	5	15	7	7	5	6
10. Previous high school vocational courses	10	9	5	10	10	9	9	5	9
11. Previous work experience in mechanics	2	3	3	1	4	5	6	1	7
12. Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	2	2	4	4	1	1	5	2	4
13. Rate of pay in mechanics	4	1	2	3	3	2	3	2	3
14. Desirable working conditions in mechanics	4	3	6	3	6	3	3	3	1
15. Job security in the mecahnical field	5	4	3	1	5	4	1	2	2
16. Good chance of job advancement in mecahanics	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3
17. Result of occupational test scores	6	5	9	10	11	8	8	4	5
18. Scholarship(s) awarded	6	4	13	15	16	11	6	4	8
19. Less money required to attend this program	9	7	9	14	19	17	7	8	8
20. Could not major in the field of my first choice	9	6	18	14	24	14	13	4	8
21. Location of this program	3	8	16	9	12	14	2	4	5
22. Newspaper articles about this program	8	12	17	15	22	18	16	7	8
23. Brochures about this program	12	11	10	13	14	12	14	5	9
24. Reputation of this program	6	5	5	8	7	1	4	5	2
25. Other reasons - please list	5	10	11	13	17	19	10	4	2
Degrees of Freedom = 24				Correlation Coefficient = 0.697					

and other. The factor ratings were sorted into these groups, and the consensus index was computed for each of the factors for the five employment status groups. The factors were then ranked, and the statistical test was run. Table XII shows the results of the rankings by the groups.

When the Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.845 was significant at the .01 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the different employment backgrounds with regard to the factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Research Question Number Twelve

> Will the relationship be significant among the ratings given by students from different sized communities to all of the factors listed relative to the extent to which they influenced the students' decisions to enter MPT programs?

Item number 12 of the questionnaire was used to divide the population into seven categories: in what size communities did the students live most of their lives: rural, less than 2,500; 2,500 to 5,000; 5,001 to 10,000; 10,001 to 20,000; 20,001 to 40,000; and over 40,000. The factor ratings were sorted into these seven groups, and the consensus index was computed for each of the factors for the groups. The factors were then ranked for the groups, and the statistical test was performed. Table XIII shows the results of the rankings for the seven groups.

When the Product-Moment Correlation was tested for significance, the calculated value of 0.874 for the groups was significant at the .001 level. It was inferred that the relationship was significant among the

TABLE XII

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUNDS TO ENTER MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Groups Previous Employment Background				
		Employed n=57	School n=12	Military n=26	Unemployed n=81	Other n=13
1.	High school guidance counselor	16	16	21	21	15
2.	High school principal	22	17	24	22	15
3.	High school teacher	14	14	16	11	17
4.	High school friends just entering the program	20	17	20	19	12
5.	Other students already enrolled in the program	21	18	18	20	14
6.	Students who have already graduated from this program	18	17	17	17	10
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	10	6	8	8	5
8.	Parents or guardians	8	10	9	8	9
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	15	9	12	16	10
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	9	10	14	12	12
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	2	2	6	5	1
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	1	2	2	3	3
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	3	1	4	1	4
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	7	3	5	6	5
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	4	7	3	4	2
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	6	2	1	2	4
17.	Result of occupational test scores	11	4	10	9	11
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	12	14	11	15	11
19.	Less money required to attend this program	19	15	17	18	13
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	22	13	22	21	16
21.	Location of this program	13	5	13	14	8
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	23	11	19	21	15
23.	Brochures about this program	15	12	15	13	12
24.	Reputation of this program	5	8	7	7	6
25.	Other reasons - please list	17	10	23	10	7

Degrees of Freedom = 24

Correlation Coefficient = 0.845

TABLE XII

THE RANKINGS OF THE FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS OF DIFFERENT SIZE COMMUNITIES TO ENTER MPT PROGRAMS

	Factors	Rankings by Groups Size of Community						
		Rural n=29	Less than 2,500 n=31	2,500 to 5,000 n=23	5,001 to 10,000 n=16	10,001 to 20,000 n=26	20,001 to 40,000 n=16	Over 40,000 n=48
1.	High school guidance counselor	17	18	15	18	19	13	20
2.	High school principal	20	20	19	19	18	14	23
3.	High school teacher	15	6	11	13	10	11	15
4.	High school friends just entering the program	18	17	17	19	17	14	16
5.	Other students already enrolled in the program	19	21	16	20	16	16	14
6.	Students who have already graduated from this program	22	14	12	15	12	8	17
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	10	9	6	6	6	1	7
8.	Parents or guardians	6	8	5	7	7	6	8
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	12	10	15	12	8	10	13
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	9	10	9	13	11	10	10
11.	Previous work experience in mechanics	2	3	2	4	3	3	5
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	1	2	1	1	2	5	2
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	3	2	3	5	1	4	3
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	7	5	3	2	5	6	4
15.	Job security in the mecahnical field	5	4	2	3	4	4	2
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mecahnics	4	1	4	3	1	2	1
17.	Result of occupational test scores	11	7	8	9	10	10	8
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	16	14	13	16	9	12	11
19.	Less money required to attend this program	15	16	15	20	13	16	21
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	23	19	18	21	15	12	22
21.	Location of this program	13	13	14	14	9	11	9
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	21	18	20	17	14	17	18
23.	Brochures about this program	15	11	18	11	11	15	12
24.	Reputation of this program	8	5	3	8	5	7	6
25.	Other reasons - please list	14	12	7	10	14	9	19

Degrees of Freedom = 24

Correlation Coefficient = 0.874

seven groups of different sized communities with regard to the factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs.

Summary

In this chapter, analysis of responses to the 12 research questions were presented. The data were treated statistically to determine if the relationship was significant among the various groups to all of the factors listed. The conclusions presented in Chapter V were drawn by analyzing the data pertaining to the 12 research questions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study analyzed many of the factors which influenced students to enter mechanical power technology programs in Oklahoma The study consisted of 195 students enrolled in seven mechanical power technology program in seven institutions in Oklahoma. The students completed a questionnaire containing two parts: (1) an inventory of student personal data, and (2) a list of 25 factors that influenced students to enroll in MPT programs.

On part one of the questionnaire, the students were asked to indicate their age, race, sex, marital status, head of household status, physically handicapped status, military background, whether or not they were receiving federal fiancnial aid, the number of years of previous education, their employment status prior to enrolling in the MPT program, and the size of the community where they had lived most of their lives. The institution in which they were enrolled was determined by previous coding of the questionnaires. On part two of the questionnaire the students were to rate the importance each individual factor had on influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs. A five-point continuum scale was used to indicate how influential each factor was to the student. The most influential position on the scale had a weight

of one and the least important position had a weight of one.

The ratings were sorted according to the groups listed in the research questions. The consensus indices were computed for each of the 25 factors, and the factors were ranked according to each group's rated importance. After the factors had been ranked, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was computed to test the significance and the strength of the relationship among the groups listed in the research questions.

An analysis of the data revealed that certain factors do have a greater influence that others on students' decisions to enter MPT programs. Those factors which were rated as most important related directly to the occupation itself: good chance of getting a job in mechanics, good chance of job advancement in mechanics, rate of pay in mechanics, previous work experience in mechanics, and job security in the mechanical field, listed in descending order. The factors rated as least important were in descending order: newspaper articles about this program, could not major in the field of my first choice, high school principal, and friends employed in the mechanical field.

An analysis of the statistical data indicated that of the groups studied there was a significant degree of relationship among all of the groups listed in the research questions with regard to the factors influencing their decisions to enter MPT programs. Some groups had a stronger degree of correlation than others when the Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation was calculated and tested at the .01 level.

Conclusions

The information presented in this study should be useful to persons

involved in student recruitment and to persons who are directly affected by student recruitment for MPT programs. It is the investigator's belief that this information could embellish the marketing plans of MPT programs if it is properly utilized.

It was interesting to the investigator that there was a strong correlation among the groups' rankings of the factors. In all of the groups the factors which related directly to job opportunities and working conditions on the job were deemed as most important in influencing the students' decisions to enter MPT programs. The factors which were most important for all groups were: (1) good chance of getting a job in mechanics, (2) good chance of job advancement in mechanics, (3) rate of pay in mechanics, (4) previous work experience in mechanics, (5) job security in the mechanical field, and (6) desirable working conditions in mechanics. The factors rated as being of least importance were: (21) other students already enrolled in this program, (22) newspaper articles about this program, (23) could not major in the field of my first choice, (24) high school principal, and (25) friends employed in the mechanical field.

One conclusion of this study was that occupational opportunities were most influential relative to MPT students' decisions to enter the program. High school guidance counselor and high school principal rated as two of the lesser influences on the students' decisions to enter MPT programs. These findings are in agreement with the findings of another study by Brooks (2).

The major conclusions of this study were that to be most effective in recruiting MPT students, the recruiter must accentuate job opportunities and work related information. Second, the marketing plans of all

persons involved in MPT student recruitment should consider the findings of this study.

Recommendations

Persons who are involved in MPT student recruitment should become familiar with the findings of this study. Persons involved in MPT student recruitment may include instructors, administrators, department heads, as well as guidance counselors.

In order to embellish the recruitment of Mechanical Power Technology students, the investigator recommends that:

1. The results of this study and other similar studies be carefully considered by those involved in MPT student recruitment and by those who are directly affected by MPT student recruitment.

2. Occupational opportunities and job related information should be accentuated for purposes of MPT student recruitment.

3. Occupational opportunities information should be disseminated at the secondary level for career guidance.

Further research is recommended in the following areas:

1. Another study should be conducted to identify the reasons that students do not enroll in MPT programs.

2. Another study should be conducted to further determine the factors which influence students' career choices.

3. A study should be undertaken to study the efforts of vocational technical schools' placement of graduates into MPT programs.

4. Studies should be conducted in other technical areas using a similar questionnaire.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arns, Kathleen F. "Editor's Notes: Responding to a Changing World." New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 9 (Spring, 1981), pp. 1-8.

2. Brooks, Richey J. "An Analysis of Factors Which Influenced Students to Enter Post-Secondary Technician Education Programs in Oklahoma," (Unpub. M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1973.)

3. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Standard Terminology for Instruction in Local and State School Systems. Third Draft, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1967.

4. Graney, Maurice W. The Technical Institute. New York, NY: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

5. Roney, Maurice W. "An Analysis of the Interrelationship of Mathmatics, Science, and Technical Subject Matter in Selected Techncial Institute Curricula." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1964.)

6. Cobb, Robert A., and V. R. Cardozin. "What Factors Influence Curriculum?" American Vocational Journal, Vol. 41 (October, 1966), p. 15.

7. Stordahl, Kalmer E. "Student Perceptions of Influences on College Choice." The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 63 (January, 1970), pp. 209-212.

8. Rowe, Fred A. "Assessing Student Information Needs for Recuriting Purposes." National ACAC Journal, Vol. 25 (July, 1980), pp. 3-8.

9. Noeth, Richard J., Harold B. Engen, and Patricia E. Noeth. "Making Career Decisions: A Report of Factors that Help High School Students." The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, Vol. 32 (June, 1984), pp. 240-248.

10. Graham, Terry G. "Impact of Selected Influences on Decisions to Attend Oklahoma State University and Major in Agriculture." (Unpub. M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State Unviersity, 1978.)

11. Stahmann, Robert F., Gary R. Hanson, and Richard R. Whittlesey. "Parent and Student Perceptions of Influences on College Choice." National ACAC Journal, Vol. 16 (July, 1977), pp. 21-22.

12. Maguire, John C. "Factors Influencing Matriculation: A Two-Year Study." National ACAC Journal, Vol. 26 (August, 1981), pp. 7-12.

13. Chapman, David W. "A Model of Student College Choice." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 52 (September/October, 1981), pp. 490-505.

14. Menacker, Julius. "Improving the Admission Information Efforts of Higher Education." National ACAC Journal, Vol. 17 (May, 1977), p.

15. Richards, James M. and John L. Holland. A Factor Analysis of Students Explanations of their Choice of a a College, No. 8. Iowa city, IA: Research and Development Division of American College Testing Program, 1964.

16. Johnson, R. H. and D. W. Chapman. "An Assessment of College Recruitment Literature: Does the High School Senior Understand It?" Research in Higher Education, Vol. 11 (1979), pp. 309-319.

17. Erdmann, David G. "An Examination of Factors Influencing Student Choice in the College Selection Process." Journal of College Admissions, Vol. 100 (Summer, 1983), pp. 3-6.

18. Dalton, Herbert F. "The College Recruiting Visit to the Secondary School." National ACAC Journal, Vol. 26 (January, 1982), pp. 4-10.

19. Tillery, D. and T. Kildegaard. Educational Goals, Attitudes, and Behaviors: A Comparative Study of High School Seniors. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1973.

20. Mundy, L. A. "Impact of Educational Development, Family Income, College Costs, and Financial Aid in Student Choice and Enrollment in College." Research Report 77. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing, 1976.

21. Davis, J. S. and W. D. VanDusen. "A Survey of Student Values and Choices: A Pilot Study of the Relationships of Student Values, Perceptions, and Choices of Institutions." New York, NY: College Entrance Examination Board, 1975.

22. Ihlanfeldt, W. Achieving Optimal Enrollments and Tuition Revenues. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

23. Super, Donald E. The Psychology of Careers. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

24. Summers, Kenneth H. "A Study of Social Status and Selected Factors Represented by Entering Freshmen and Students Completing Two Years of College Work at Flint Community Junior College." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.)

25. Anthony, Donald M. "The Relationship of Certain Socioeconomical and Academic Factors to Student Choice of Occupation and Programs in the Public Junior College." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1965.)

26. Trent, James W. and Leland W. Medsker. Beyond High School. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1967.

27. Popham, W. James and Kenneth A. Sirotnik. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. Second Edition. New York, NY: Harper and Row, Inc., 1973.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please place an (X) in the appropriate space.

1. Age: __18-22 __23-27 __28-32
__33-37 __38-42 __over 42

2. Race: __Indian __Black __White
__Mexican American
__Other (please specify)
_____

3. Sex: __male __female

4. Marital status: __single __married
__divorced __widowed

5. Are you the head of a household?
__yes __no

6. Are you physically handicapped?
__yes __no

7. Are you presently in the military?
__yes __no

If yes, please check the duty type below:
__active __reserves __national guard

How long have you been the military?
__less than 1 yr. __1-2 yrs. __2-3 yrs.
__over 3 years

8. Were you once in the military?
__yes __no

If yes, please check the duty type below:
__active __reserves __national guard

How long were you in the military?
__less than 1 yr. __1-2 yrs. __2-3 yrs.

9. Are you receiving financial aid to attend school under one of the following? (check as many as apply)
__GI bill __social security __B.I.A
__other (please specify):_____
__none of the above

10. How many years of school did you complete before entering this program?
__8 or less __9 __10 __11 __12
__13 __14 __15 __16 or more

11. What were you doing before you enrolled in this program? (check as many as apply)
__school __military __unemployed
__employed full time __other (please specify): _____

12. In what size community have you lived most of your life? __rural
__less than 2,500 __2,500 to 5,000
__5,001 to 10,000 __10,001 to 20,000
__20,001 to 40,000 __over 40,000

Please rank the importance the following had on your decision to enter this program.

	Very Important	Quite Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
1. High school guidance counselor	/	/	/	/	/
2. High school principal	/	/	/	/	/
3. High school teacher, (Please list his/her teaching area): _____	/	/	/	/	/
4. High school friends just entering the program	/	/	/	/	/
5. Other students already enrolled in this program	/	/	/	/	/
6. Students who have graduated from this program	/	/	/	/	/

CA

		Most Important	Quite Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
7.	Friends employed in the mechanical field	/	/	/	/	/
8.	Parents or guardians	/	/	/	/	/
9.	Relatives such as uncles, brothers or sisters	/	/	/	/	/
10.	Previous high school vocational courses	/	/	/	/	/
11.	Work experience in mechanics	/	/	/	/	/
12.	Good chance of getting a job in mechanics	/	/	/	/	/
13.	Rate of pay in mechanics	/	/	/	/	/
14.	Desirable working conditions in mechanics	/	/	/	/	/
15.	Job security in the mechanical field	/	/	/	/	/
16.	Good chance of job advancement in mechanics	/	/	/	/	/
17.	Result of occupational test scores	/	/	/	/	/
18.	Scholarship(s) awarded	/	/	/	/	/
19.	Less money required to attend this program	/	/	/	/	/
20.	Could not major in the field of my first choice	/	/	/	/	/
21.	Location of this program	/	/	/	/	/
22.	Newspaper articles about this program	/	/	/	/	/
23.	Brochures about this program	/	/	/	/	/
24.	Reputation of this program	/	/	/	/	/
25.	Please list other reasons why you chose this program					
	_____	/	/	/	/	/
	_____	/	/	/	/	/

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO DEPARTMENT HEADS

Ray E. Sanders
Box 123A, Route One
Howe, Okla. 74940
Phone 918-658-3902
Work 918-647-2124

Dr. J.D. Wilhoit
Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College
Miami, Okla. 74354

Dr. J.D. Wilhoit,

As a technical educator, one of the major problems I have recognized is the recruitment of students. I have chosen to research this problem for my Masters Thesis at Oklahoma State University. The purpose of this research is to analyze the factors which influence students to enter mechanical power programs in Oklahoma.

I would greatly appreciate your distributing the enclosed questionnaires to all of your first year Automechanics students. The questionnaire is one page in length and has two parts: (1) information about the student and (2) a list of factors the student is to rate as to the level of importance they had on influencing him to enter the program. Completing the questionnaire will require a few minutes. Please return the completed questionnaires in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope by September 15, 1984.

The information obtained by this project will be of interest and help to all of us. I will furnish you with a copy of the results as soon as they are available. Thank you for your cooperarion.

Sincerely,
Ray E. Sanders

Enclosures
RES/mcs

VITA 2

Ray Edmund Sanders

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENTS TO ENTER MECHANICAL POWER TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA

Major Field: Technical Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Gardena, California, March 25, 1957, the son of Roy E. and Mary Sanders. Married to Catherine LaRosa December 20, 1975.

Education: Graduated from Poteau High School, Poteau, Oklahoma in May, 1975; received Bachelor of Science in Trade and Industrial Education in July, 1980; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1985.

Professional Experience: Teacher of Automechanics at Boswell High School, Boswell, Oklahoma, from August, 1979 to May, 1980; Teacher of Auto Service Management at Carl Albert Junior College, Poteau, Oklahoma, from August, 1980 to present.

Professional Organizations: Member of the Oklahoma Technical Society, Kappa Delta Phi, National Institute of Automotive Service Excellence, Higher Education Alumni Association of Oklahoma.