

A STUDY OF FULL-TIME ADULT STUDENT DROPOUTS AT  
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL  
OF TECHNICAL TRAINING

By

JAMES GRANT MAYBERRY

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1952

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, 1977

Thesis  
1977  
m467s  
cop. 2



A STUDY OF FULL-TIME ADULT STUDENT DROPOUTS AT  
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL  
OF TECHNICAL TRAINING

Thesis Approved:

*Lloyd D Briggs*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Lloyd Wiggins*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Cecil Dugger*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman N. Murkum*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

977094

## PREFACE

This study is concerned with identifying the problem areas which tend to cause students to drop out of their programs at Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training and to recommend a method which might help reduce the dropout rate. The Chi-square Test was used to evaluate the data supplied from the check-out forms used at the time of a student's termination.

The author wishes to express his appreciation to his major adviser, Dr. Lloyd Briggs, for his guidance and assistance throughout this study. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. James Key for his valuable help during the preliminary stages of this study.

A note of thanks to Mr. Cary Fox for his help in locating data and to Mr. Davis Sellers for his help in the computer center.

Finally, a very special gratitude is expressed to my wife, Phyllis, and our son Scott for their understanding, encouragement, and many sacrifices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	1
Need for the Study . . . . .	2
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	3
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	3
Assumptions . . . . .	4
Definition of Terms . . . . .	4
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	6
Personality . . . . .	7
Interest . . . . .	9
Values . . . . .	10
Socioeconomic Position . . . . .	11
Conclusions . . . . .	12
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	14
Population . . . . .	14
Statistical Methods and Procedures . . . . .	15
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	17
Research Question One . . . . .	18
Research Question Two . . . . .	20
Research Question Three . . . . .	20
Research Question Four . . . . .	22
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	37
Significant Findings . . . . .	38
Conclusions . . . . .	43
Recommendations . . . . .	43
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	45
APPENDIX A--OKLAHOMA STATE TECH EXIT SURVEY . . . . .	50
APPENDIX B--STUDENT PROGRESS REFERRAL REPORT . . . . .	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Comparison of All Dropouts by Years (1972-1975) . . . . .	19
II. Comparison of Differing Age Groups (1972-1975) . . . . .	21
III. Comparison of Total Responses by Sexes for Years (1972-1975) . . . . .	23
IV. Comparison of Age Group (17½ - 20) for 1972 . . . . .	24
V. Comparison of Age Group (17½ - 20) for 1973 . . . . .	25
VI. Comparison of Age Group (17½ - 20) for 1974 . . . . .	26
VII. Comparison of Age Group (17½ - 20) for 1975 . . . . .	27
VIII. Comparison of Age Group (21 - 30) for 1972 . . . . .	29
IX. Comparison of Age Group (21 - 30) for 1973 . . . . .	30
X. Comparison of Age Group (21 - 30) for 1974 . . . . .	31
XI. Comparison of Age Group (21 - 30) for 1975 . . . . .	32
XII. Comparison of Age Group (31+) for 1972 . . . . .	33
XIII. Comparison of Age Group (31+) for 1973 . . . . .	34
XIV. Comparison of Age Group (31+) for 1974 . . . . .	35
XV. Comparison of Age Group (31+) for 1975 . . . . .	36

## CHAPTER I

### THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

#### Introduction

Through the years the number of full-time students who dropped out of their course of study at Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training in Okmulgee, Oklahoma has been very low. As a result of the low number of dropouts, very little attention was given to the problem. In the past five years, however, a greater number of the full-time students have dropped out.

Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training located at Okmulgee, Oklahoma is unique in the field of post secondary education. It is the only school of this type that offers on-campus housing. With the variety of technical areas of instruction available to the students, each student is required to take a variety of General Education subjects which reinforce the material covered in his or her field of study.

It was felt that it would be a disservice to the student and to society if every avenue which could help the student continue his or her endeavor to a satisfactory completion was not examined.

#### Statement of the Problem

One function of an administrative division of the School of Technical Training involves the classification and guidance of students who enroll in their educational programs. Counselors and administrators in

this administrative division are attempting to accomplish this task without the aid of adequate and reliable indicators or descriptors which characterize the potential technical student dropout. The lack of information relative to characteristics of the potential dropout is the problem with which this study is concerned.

#### Need for the Study

Many semi-professional jobs require skills which can be obtained in a two-year technical program. Demands from employers for graduates from these programs has increased the need for an additional number of programs being offered. Many of these programs are still in the developmental stages and their continuing development consumes a great quantity of time. Most new developmental programs are under financial pressure due to the cost of new equipment and the demand and urgency to obtain results. Increasing enrollments place additional strain on the existing programs to provide and maintain quality. These factors all combine to make the jobs of administrators and counselors increasingly difficult without reliable information and guidelines to follow in helping the student continue to a successful achievement of his or her objectives. The need to identify the characteristics of potential dropouts and to establish guidelines for assisting potential non-successful students before they feel the need to terminate their course of study is crucial to the development and improvement of a viable student services program in an educational institution.



### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to collect, organize, and summarize information about dropouts in such a way that it might be used in the programs to help decrease the dropout rate at Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training.

Special questions posed in relation to this purpose were:

1. In analyzing reasons for dropping out of the program as stated by the student, department head, or counselor, are there significant differences between those indicated for (a) female and male, (b) differing age groups, and (c) differing age groups by sexes?
2. Would modifications to existing procedures allow determination and solution of dropout problems?

### Limitations of the Study

Limitations of the study are:

1. Information about students was restricted to the informational files of Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training.
2. Although this study concerns dropouts, it is not concerned with social, economic, or prior educational background of the student.
3. Some of the students had more than one reason given for dropping out of school. Without contacting the student, it was impossible to determine which of the reasons indicated was the prime reason for termination.

### Assumptions

The design of this study was based upon several assumptions:

1. It was assumed that the students entering technical education programs in the years 1972-1975 would be similar to the technical education students in the foreseeable future. The validity of this assumption was supported by the work of Astin (1964, p. 51) who cited several studies which show that the general characteristics of students in an institution at a given point in time remain relatively stable over a period of several years.

2. It was assumed that students selected for this study, as well as the counselors and department heads who made entries on the students' records, responded accurately to the instruments used to record the data.

3. It was assumed that the raw data used in this study did not vary in overall accuracy for the period in time in which the data was collected.

### Definition of Terms

Dropout: As used in this study, a student who terminated a course of study without graduating.

Student: As used in this study, a person enrolled in a full-time program of study.

Persisting, or Successful Student: As used in this study, a student who completes his or her area of study.

Technical Education: A planned sequence of classroom and laboratory experiences at the post-secondary level designed to prepare persons for a cluster of job opportunities in a specialized field of

technology (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967, p. 573).

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A new dimension in post-high school education has been gaining prominence over the last few decades. Technical institutes have become increasingly popular as alternatives to the traditional four-year academic college program. The provision of federal funds for these programs has contributed to their rapid proliferation, especially in the last fifteen years. The urgency with which these programs have been established, understandably, has created certain difficulties, particularly in the areas surrounding methods for determining admissions standards and for creating curricula which will satisfy the needs of the students. Thus, the administrators and counselors are faced with the dual problem of operating the technical institute while at the same time attempting to establish viable guidelines for their operation. It has been common practice to use such intellectual factors as high school grades and scholastic achievement tests as criteria for admission to technical programs, just as they are used for admission to many college academic programs. This would have a tendency to reduce the number of non-achievers permitted to start a field of study by college academic standards, even though these standards might not apply to the ability of the student to achieve at a technical institute. Greenwood (1963) stressed the idea that many important factors which influence student success, such as motivation and study habits, are so difficult to

identify that prediction of academic success is not likely to be completely accurate.

The goal of a technical program is to prepare students for direct entry into technical career positions by concentrating on skills necessary for specific occupational choices without emphasizing "liberal arts" backgrounds. It would appear that there might be other factors which could be used to predict success or failure of technical education students. Romine (1970) stressed the idea that intellectual measures are simply not enough for predicting even academic success. He indicated that not enough intense interest has been shown over the last 20 years in identifying particular characteristics which can be reliably used for this purpose. This chapter, therefore, is a review of the research that has been conducted relative to selected variables, with particular attention directed toward technical students.

### Personality

Among the studies investigating personality factors and their possible use as measures to predict academic achievement, results have been inconclusive at best, if not, in some instances, contradictory. Stagner (1963, p. 660) viewed the problem in determining personality factors as follows:

It becomes increasingly clear that personality influences achievement in an indirect way, by affecting the degree to which use is made of the individual's potentialities and may explain the low correlation between personality test scores and achievement. At some point along the distribution, personality is an advantage in academic work while different amounts of the same personality variables may be disadvantageous, or may be operative in one direction in one case, the opposite in a similar situation.

In a study conducted by Stinson (1955) using the Minnesota Multi-phase Personality Inventory (MMPI), significant differences were found between engineering graduates, non-engineering graduates, and dropouts. Brown and Dubois (1964), however, did find that academic achievement could be predicted for engineering students, using the MMPI for which three of the six scales showed significant differences.

When Miller (1966) compared technical students with engineering students, he found the engineering students to be more theoretically oriented with a significantly higher need to dominate and to have more motivation for achievement. The technical students, on the other hand, had a greater need to be helped along and "nurtured".

In a comparison of persisting technical students with dropouts, Grande (1964) found that persisting students had a higher need for achievement and worked harder, using more self-control. In addition, Grande and Simons (1967) found that persisting students are more willing to struggle and plan for success and are more critical about their work habits. Hyman (1957) also determined the need to be "nurtured" as a significant personality variable distinguishing dropouts from persistors. Hoyt (1962) described the successful technical student as being "things" oriented and the dropout as being "people" oriented. Hanson and Taylor (1970) distinguished between personality factors and ability factors, determining that personality is a better predictor of persisting or dropping out, and ability is a better predictor of success. Thus, Cowell and Entwistle (1971) found that introverted personality types in a technical college did only marginally better than extroverts.

Personality factors have been studied also to determine their influence on career choices. There seems to be more proof that a relationship exists in this respect. Boe (1964) suggested that there are relationships between early experiences and attitudes, abilities, and personality factors which affect the ultimate vocational choice of the student. As Holland (1959) explained, "the person making a vocational choice in a sense 'searches' for situations which satisfy his hierarchy of adjustive orientation." Osipow, Ashley, and Wall (1966), in a follow-up study, supported Holland's observation that there is a correlation between personality and career choice. Stewart (1971) felt that personality tests and interest tests measured the same variables with respect to occupational choice, but found that interest tests were clearly the better predictors in that they measured the actual choices, while personality tests measured risk choices.

When Tallmadge and Shearer (1969) manipulated instructional methods and subject content, they produced a variance they called "learning style". From results of this study, they concluded that there is an identifiable nonintellectual profile for students who had higher achievement rates when taught certain subject matter in a certain way. This led them to hypothesize that technical students in a unique curriculum utilizing certain teaching methods could be expected to exhibit a predictable personality.

#### Interest

In attempting to predict success, Berdie and Sutter (1950) found the best overall predictor of grades in college to be the student's rank in high school. Miller (1966), in contradiction, concluded that it was

more important for the technical student to have an intense interest in the application of mathematics and science, along with the maturity and personal characteristics which enable him to work for and with others. Ewens (1963), however, from a study of interests and aptitude, simply concluded that further research was needed to determine the reliability of using personality profiles, interests, and school grades in determining aptitudes.

When Speer (1948) compared freshman engineering students to other freshmen, he found different interest patterns. In a comparison of the interest patterns of four-year engineering students and two-year technical program students by Herman and Ziegler (1960), it was found that interests were more closely related to degree of success than to type of curriculum.

As far as any one interest being a major predictor of success, both Miller (1966) and Anderson (1970) found an interest in the specialized fields of technology to be helpful. Greenwood (1963) earlier had concluded that there was no one interest factor which would predict success or failure in a technical program.

#### Values

Studies as to the use of values as a predictor of success have been conflicting in their results. For instance, Hilton and Kern (1964) found that values in college can change in as short a period as nine months, and Olive (1969) found the values of senior college students to be different from those of freshmen, particularly with respect to their perception of occupational role. Lindeman (1970) found that the values demonstrated by senior engineering students were different from those



demonstrated by freshmen, sophomores, and juniors. All of these studies object to Jacob's (1957) findings that the values of college students do not change during their college careers.

Miller (1966) reported that values were closely related to occupational choice, while Karn (1952) found significant differences between the values of various engineering majors.

Also with respect to the reliability of values, Rexler (1960) found significant differences between high achievers and low achievers, but Rightland (1965) found no significant differences between persistors and dropouts in a technical program.

#### Socioeconomic Position

It long has been assumed that few students from the lower socioeconomic class attend college and that, if they do, they stand a large chance of dropping out. In answer to this myth, Miller (1966) found that socioeconomic position influenced the decision to attend a technical school over a four-year college and Gille (1970) found that the families of technical students have a lower annual income than families of junior college students. In support of this, statistics compiled by Lindsay, Hoover, and Kepler (1967) indicate that the average educational attainment of fathers of technical students was 11.2 years, while that of fathers of college students was 12.2 years. Medsker and Trent (1965) found similar data for the mothers, with the average educational level 11.4 years for mothers of technical students and 12.0 for mothers of college students. Bradfield (1967), after summarizing several studies, concluded that the rates of college attendance are greater for students from upper socioeconomic groups.

Studies by both Hoyt (1966) and the Educational Testing Service (1968) indicated that about 60 per cent of technical students do not receive financial assistance from their families, and Gillie (1970) found that 42 per cent of the technical students sampled in his research held full-time jobs, and another 21 per cent held part-time jobs.

At least two studies (Astin, 1964) (Caskey, 1943) have shown that the majority of college dropouts come from families with lower socioeconomic status. But Miller (1966) found no significant difference between persistors and dropouts on the basis of social class background; and Schroder and Sledge (1966) indicated that personal variables and motivation may be more important than their socioeconomic level as factors influencing college achievement.

### Conclusions

The review of literature has shown that, although some research has been conducted to determine the effect of nonintellectual variables on achievement and persistence by post-high school students, most of the results have been inconclusive and clearly point out the need for further investigation into the variables of personality, interests, values, and socioeconomic position. In addition, much of this research was directed toward engineering students in four-year programs rather than toward technical students in two-year programs. Bradshaw (1968) described the trend in research studies as follows:

Research specifically pointed toward factors significantly related to academic success of technical education students has been limited in the past, but with the increasing societal demand and the ascending role of the technician, a small increase in studies was noted. However, the number of

investigations has remained small and almost all of these reported are localized and limited in scope (p. 87).

Without using any specific measures, Hall (1967) described the typical technical student as follows:

(He is) work oriented, pragmatic, has an unquenchable sense of curiosity and comes to school with clearly established career goals. The technical student will show a strong aptitude in the mathematical, scientific, and mechanical areas, but will show little interest in English and social studies. The technical student's scores on standardized intelligence tests may not be a good indication of his true potential as a student, since these tests are largely verbal based. Finally, the technical student does not possess a deep social consciousness concerning what some students consider great issues of the day (p. 342).

It remains for descriptions such as the one above to be proved or disproved, so that counselors and administrators in technical education programs will be able to have some reliable guidelines to use in selection, training, and occupational placement for technical education students.

The ability of counselors and administrators to detect any deviation in a student's performance at an early period should be a prime objective in a technical institute. This ability to detect a possible cause for a student to drop out at the earliest time could allow that student to change and continue his course of study.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to collect, organize, and summarize information about dropouts at Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training in such a way that it might be used in the program to increase the effectiveness of counselors and administrators relative to student advisement. Specifically, this study was directed toward identifying reasons for students dropping out of their programs and providing detectors to be used in the early stages of non-attrition so that the student would be able to complete his or her course of study.

#### Population

All students in this study were selected from Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training. As do its counterparts in other states, Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training encourages full or part-time enrollment. For this study, only full-time students were used.

Data on the dropouts was compiled from the official records and computer files of Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training from the years 1972-1975. This data contained 100 per cent of the dropouts in these years (3,723 students).

## Statistical Methods and Procedures

Research Question One: Are there any significant differences in reasons given by students from one year to the next for dropping out of school?

To answer this question, the Chi-square technique was used to determine significant differences at the .95 level of confidence of percentages calculated on the total number of dropouts by the academic year as related to specific questions asked the student at the time of termination.

Research Question Two: Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing age groups?

To answer this question, the Chi-square technique was used to determine significant differences at the .95 level of confidence of percentages calculated on the total number of dropouts by age groups, (17½ to 20), (21 to 30), (31+) by academic years, as related to specific questions asked the students at the time of termination.

Research Question Three: Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing sexes?

To answer this question, the Chi-square technique was used to determine significant differences at the .95 level of confidence of percentages calculated on the total number of dropouts by sex as related to specific questions asked the student at the time of termination.

Research Question Four: Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing age groups and by sexes?

To answer this question, the Chi-square technique was used to determine significant differences at the .95 level of confidence of percentages on all male dropouts calculated by age groups and by academic years. The same technique was used on all female dropouts calculated by age groups and by academic years.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to collect, organize, and summarize specific information related to the reasons given by dropouts at the time of their termination. Those reasons given for dropping out are:

1. Disciplinary;
2. Personal;
3. Financial;
4. Illness;
5. Left school without officially checking out;
6. Going to work;
7. Excessive absences;
8. Lack of progress;
9. Dissatisfaction with school;
10. Cancel enrollment;
11. Military service; and
12. Going to another school.

It was found that a student could have several reasons listed for dropping out of school. If a student had only one reason listed, it could have been the only reason that the student felt was necessary. It could have been the reason listed by the department head or counselor for the student dropping out; such as, (5) left school without officially checking out.

When two or more reasons were listed, it was due to a student listing a reason and a department head or counselor adding other reasons not stated by the student; such as, (1) disciplinary, (7) excessive absences, or (8) lack of progress. This amounted to 21% of the students dropping out.

Another source of error which could not be removed from the data was the student listing (2) "personal" for a valid reason instead of a more appropriate reason.

#### Research Question One

Research Question One: Are there any significant differences in reasons given by students from one year to the next for dropping out of school?

To answer research question one, the Chi-square Test was run on the total number of students dropping out each year for the years 1972-1975. the null hypothesis, as stated at the bottom of Table I, was rejected due to the marked difference between the calculated total (68.6815) and the predicted total of (47.3979) at the .95 level with 33 degrees of freedom.

An analysis of Table I shows that the differences appear greatest between the 1972 dropouts and the 1973 dropouts. There was a marked increase in those being dropped for disciplinary reasons (1972 - .9%, 1973 - 4.3%). Another increase was noted in the number leaving school without officially checking out (1972 - 16.4%, 1973 - 24.5%). There was a marked decrease in the number leaving school to work (1972 - 17%, 1973 - 5.8%). Excessive absences increased from 16.1% in 1972 to more than 28% in 1974 and 1975. Those leaving because of dissatisfaction



TABLE I  
COMPARISON OF ALL DROPOUTS BY YEARS (1972-1975)

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	All Student Dropouts				Totals
	1972	1973	1974	1975	
1. Disciplinary	(1.9) .9	(2) 4.3	(2.7) 2.9	(2.1) 2.2	10.3
2. Personal	(18.1) 19.3	(18.8) 25	(25.5) 27	(19.7) 25.6	96.9
3. Financial	(3.5) 3.2	(3.7) 3.9	(4.9) 7.1	(3.8) 4.6	18.8
4. Illness	(5.3) 7.2	(5.5) 7.7	(7.5) 7	(5.8) 6.7	28.6
5. Left school without officially checking out	(15.6) 16.4	(16.2) 24.5	(21.9) 22.1	(16.9) 20.4	83.4
6. Going to work	(7.8) 17	(8.1) 5.8	(10.9) 8.5	(8.4) 10.3	41.6
7. Excessive absences	(17.6) 16.1	(18.2) 21.4	(24.7) 28.3	(19.1) 28.2	94
8. Lack of progress	(6.2) 7.4	(6.4) 6.7	(8.7) 8.2	(6.7) 10.9	33.2
9. Dissatisfied with school	(.6) 2	(.6) .6	(.8) .4	(.6) .2	3.2
10. Cancel enrollment	(1.6) 5.4	(1.6) 1.2	(2.2) 1.1	(1.7) .7	8.4
11. Military service	(.9) 3.6	(.9) 1	(1.2) 0	(.9) 0	4.6
12. Going to another school	(1.0) 2.7	(1.1) 2.9	(1.5) 0	(1.1) 0	5.6
Totals	101.2	105	112.6	109.8	428.6

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant differences in reasons stated for dropping out of school from one year to the next by students.

Calculated Total = 68.6815.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 47.3979$ .

df = 33.

$H_0$  = Rejected.

with the school decreased from 2% in 1972 to .2% in 1975. Those canceling enrollment before attending school decreased from 5.4% in 1972 to .7% in 1975.

#### Research Question Two

Research Question Two: Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing age groups?

To answer research question two, the Chi-square test was conducted on combined totals of differing age groups (17½ to 20), (21 to 30), and (31+) for the years 1972 through 1975. An analysis of Table II shows that the age group (17½ to 20) has more disciplinary problems, 29%, than both the other groups combined. The 17½ to 20 age group also indicated the greatest percentage of dropouts due to personal problems. Financial reasons for the 31+ age group was slightly higher than the other groups and illness greatly increased with the 31+ age group.

The 21 to 30 age group had more who left school without officially checking out and had more excessive absences than the other two groups.

Table II shows a general tendency for the younger age group to be involved in disciplinary problems which generate problems in the areas of grades and attendance while the older group, 31+ become more involved with illness and financial problems.

#### Research Question Three

Research Question Three: Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing sexes?

TABLE II  
COMPARISON OF DIFFERING AGE GROUPS (1972-1975)

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Age Group			Totals
	17½ to 20	21 to 30	31+	
1. Disciplinary	(15) 29	(14.5) 13.9	(15.3) 1.9	44.8
2. Personal	(248) 274	(238.5) 228.5	(252.7) 236.8	739.3
3. Financial	(31.2) 27.6	(30) 25.9	(31.8) 39.4	92.9
4. Illness	(89.6) 52.	(86) 68	(91.2) 146.9	266.9
5. Left school without officially checking out	(140.8) 130	(135.4) 156.9	(143.5) 132.9	419.8
6. Going to work	(86.5) 84.1	(83.2) 75.5	(88.1) 98.2	257.8
7. Excessive absences	(197) 193.6	(189.4) 202.8	(200.1) 190.8	587.2
8. Lack of progress	(61.2) 71.6	(58.8) 64.7	(62.4) 46.1	182.4
9. Dissatisfied with school	(4.2) 5.2	(4) 4.9	(4.3) 2.5	12.6
10. Cancel enrollment	(14.5) 12.4	(13.9) 18.2	(14.8) 12.6	43.2
11. Military service	(3.6) 8.9	(3.5) 1.8	(3.7) 0	10.7
12. Going to another school	(4.2) 7.5	(4) .2	(4.2) 4.7	12.4
Totals	895.9	861.3	912.8	2670

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant differences in reasons stated by students dropping out of school by age groups.

Calculated total = 122.12.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 33.924$ .

df = (12-1)(3-1) = 22.

$H_0$  = rejected.

To answer research question three, the Chi-square test was conducted on all male and female dropouts for the years 1972 through 1975.

An analysis of Table III shows very little differences in disciplinary problems, but a great difference in personal problems; with the female showing the largest percentage. The male had more financial problems and led in all the other categories except dropping out to go to work.

Table III indicates that females are less inclined to establish a direct reason for dropping out and would rather use the "catch-all" category of "personal".

#### Research Question Four

Research Question Four: Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing age groups and by sexes?

To answer research question four, the Chi-square Test was conducted on each age group by sexes for each year.

The null hypothesis for the year 1972 was rejected (Table IV) due to the large percentage difference between male and female answer number two (personal). The female percentage was much larger than the male response.

The male percentage for leaving school without officially checking out, financial reasons, and those leaving for military service were higher than the female.

Tables V, VI, and VII do show that no significant differences occur between male and female reasons for dropping out of school in the same age group.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF TOTAL RESPONSES BY SEXES FOR YEARS 1972-1975

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(22.8) 23.9	(22.2) 21.1	45
2. Personal	(360.3) 254.6	(352) 457.7	712.3
3. Financial	(47) 66	(45.9) 26.9	92.9
4. Illness	(135) 124	(131.9) 142.9	266.9
5. Left school without officially checking out	(212.4) 272.8	(207.4) 147	419.8
6. Going to work	(130.4) 123.8	(127.3) 133.9	257.7
7. Excessive absences	(296.5) 321.8	(289.7) 264.4	586.2
8. Lack of progress	(92.3) 89.2	(90.1) 93.2	182.4
9. Dissatisfied with school	(6.4) 10.1	(6.2) 2.5	12.6
10. Cancel enrollment	(21.9) 26.5	(21.3) 16.7	43.2
11. Military service	(5.4) 10.7	(5.3) 0	10.7
12. Going to another school	(12.2) 19.1	(12) 5.1	24.2
Totals	1342.5	1311.4	2653.9

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons given by male and female for dropping out of school.

Calculated Total = 149.122.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 19.675$ .

df = (12-1)(2-1) = 11.

$H_0$  = rejected.

TABLE IV  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP ( $17\frac{1}{2}$  - 20) FOR 1972

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(1.4) 1.2	(1.2) 1.6	2.8
2. Personal	(30.7) 19.2	(27.2) 38.7	57.9
3. Financial	(1.7) 3.2	(1.5) 0	3.2
4. Illness	(6.3) 3.8	(5.6) 8.1	11.9
5. Left school without officially checking out	(14.6) 17.8	(12.9) 9.7	27.5
6. Going to work	(20.1) 18.4	(17.7) 19.4	37.8
7. Excessive absences	(18.3) 18.4	(16.2) 16.1	34.5
8. Lack of progress	(8.4) 11.1	(7.5) 4.8	15.9
9. Dissatisfied with school	(1.8) 1.7	(1.6) 1.6	3.3
10. Cancel enrollment	(3.7) 7	(3.3) 0	7
11. Military service	(3.6) 6.7	(3.1) 0	6.7
12. Going to another school	(1.5) 2.9	(1.4) 0	2.9
Totals	111.4	98.4	209.8

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant differences in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the ( $17\frac{1}{2}$  - 20) age group in the year 1972.

Calculated Total = 31.18751.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 19.675$ .

df = (12-1)(2-1) = 11.

$H_0$  = Rejected.

TABLE V  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP ( $17\frac{1}{2}$  - 20) FOR 1973

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students dropping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(6.3) 6.2	(6.4) 6.5	12.7
2. Personal	(34.3) 29.3	(34.8) 39.8	69.1
3. Financial	(2.8) 3.8	(2.9) 1.9	5.7
4. Illness	(7.7) 3.5	(7.8) 12	15.5
5. Left school without officially checking out	(17) 21.2	(17.2) 13	34.2
6. Going to work	(3.9) 5.1	(4) 2.8	7.9
7. Excessive absences	(19.2) 22	(19.5) 16.7	38.7
8. Lack of progress	(8.7) 7.3	(8.8) 10.2	17.5
9. Dissatisfied with school	(.8) .8	(.9) .9	1.7
10. Cancel enrollment	(1.7) 1.6	(1.8) 1.9	3.5
11. Military service	(1.1) 2.2	(1.1) 0	2.2
12. Going to another school	(2.3) 2.7	(2.3) 1.9	4.6
Totals	105.9	107.6	213.5

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the ( $17\frac{1}{2}$  - 20) age group in the year 1973.

Calculated Total = 13.06456.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 19.675$ .

df =  $(12-1)(2-1) = 11$ .

$H_0$  = Accepted.

TABLE VI  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (17½ - 20) FOR 1974

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(3.7) 2.6	(3.8) 4.9	7.5
2. Personal	(33.3) 26.9	(33.4) 39.8	66.7
3. Financial	(4.7) 5.4	(4.8) 4.1	9.5
4. Illness	(6) 3.1	(6) 8.9	12
5. Left school without officially checking out	(18.3) 22.9	(18.4) 13.8	36.7
6. Going to work	(9.2) 12	(9.3) 6.5	18.5
7. Excessive absences	(25.7) 25.5	(25.8) 26	51.5
8. Lack of progress	(6.6) 8.3	(6.6) 4.9	13.2
9. Dissatisfied with school	(.1) .2	(.1) 0	.2
10. Cancel enrollment	(8.5) 1.7	(8.5) 0	1.7
11. Military service	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
12. Going to another school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
Totals	108.6	108.9	217.5

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the (17½ - 20) age group in the year 1974.

Calculated Total = 17.4416.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 18.307$ .

df = (11-1)(2-1) = 10.

$H_0$  = Accepted.



TABLE VII  
 COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (17½ - 20) FOR 1975

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(3.2) 3.1	(3) 3.1	6.2
2. Personal	(27.4) 21.5	(25.7) 31.8	53.3
3. Financial	(4.7) 3.8	(4.5) 5.4	9.2
4. Illness	(6.5) 3.3	(6.1) 9.3	12.6
5. Left school without officially checking out	(16.3) 20.7	(15.3) 10.9	31.6
6. Going to work	(10.2) 12.1	(9.7) 7.8	19.9
7. Excessive absences	(35.5) 38.7	(33.4) 30.2	68.9
8. Lack of progress	(12.9) 13.4	(12.1) 11.6	25
9. Dissatisfied with school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
10. Cancel enrollment	(.1) .2	(.1) 0	.2
11. Military service	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
12. Going to another school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
Totals	106.8	110.1	226.9

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the (17½ - 20) age group in the year 1975.

Calculated Total = 10.28165.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 16.919$ .

df = 8

$H_0$  = Accepted.

For the age group 21 to 30, Tables VIII, IX, X, and XI do show differing reasons between male and female for dropping out of school. The largest consecutive difference lies in question number two (personal). The female average percentage was higher in each case than the male response for this question. The male responses in this age group indicate that they are more prone to leave school without officially checking out and their lack of progress is higher than the female. The male in this age group tends to have more financial problems than the female.

Tables XII, XIII, and XIV for the age group 31+ indicate that there are significant differences in reasons stated by male and female for dropping out of school. The greatest difference in this age group lies in the response to question number two (personal). The female response was substantially higher in percentage for all years tested than the male.

The male responses indicated that they were more prone to leave school without officially checking out and had more financial problems.

Table XV indicated no significant differences in reasons stated by male and female for dropping out of school. Even though the null hypothesis had to be accepted, areas of difference were noted in reason number two (personal), where the percentage of female responses was high. In question number seven (excessive absences) the male response was high.

TABLE VIII  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (21 - 30) FOR 1972

Reasons given by students, Counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(.4) .8	(.4) 0	.8
2. Personal	(24.9) 18.9	(19.8) 25.8	44.7
3. Financial	(3.8) 6.8	(3) 0	6.8
4. Illness	(12.6) 12.9	(10) 9.7	22.6
5. Left school without officially checking out	(18.1) 19.7	(14.5) 12.9	32.6
6. Going to work	(17.8) 15.9	(14.2) 16.1	32
7. Excessive absences	(12.5) 15.9	(9.9) 6.5	22.4
8. Lack of progress	(3.9) 3.8	(3.1) 3.2	7
9. Dissatisfied with school	(2.1) 3.8	(1.7) 0	3.8
10. Cancel enrollment	(7.5) 3.8	(6) 9.7	13.5
11. Military service	(.8) 1.5	(.7) 0	1.5
12. Going to another school	(4.7) 5.3	(3.8) 3.2	8.5
Totals	109.1	87.1	169.2

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the age group (21 - 30) in the year 1972.

Calculated Total = 20.85467.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 19.675$ .

df = 11.

$H_0$  = Rejected.

TABLE IX  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (21 - 30) FOR 1973

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(2) 2.8	(3.7) 2.9	.8
2. Personal	(21.7) 24.5	(39.9) 37.1	44.7
3. Financial	(1.3) 3.8	(2.5) 0	3.8
4. Illness	(7.6) 7.3	(14) 14.3	21.6
5. Left school without official officially checking out	(17.5) 29.7	(32.2) 20	49.7
6. Going to work	(4.8) 8	(8.9) 5.7	13.7
7. Excessive absences	(13.2) 23.1	(24.2) 14.3	37.4
8. Lack of progress	(3.7) 4.9	(6.9) 5.7	10.6
9. Dissatisfied with school	(.1) .3	(.2) 0	.3
10. Cancel enrollment	(.2) .7	(.5) 0	.7
11. Military service	(.1) .3	(.2) 0	.3
12. Going to another school	(1.2) 3.5	(2.3) 0	3.5
Totals	108.9	200	308.9

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the (21 - 30) age group in the year 1973.

Calculated Total = 40.81605.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 19.675$ .

df = 11.

$H_0$  = Rejected.

TABLE X  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (21 - 30) FOR 1974

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(2.7) 3.3	(2.7) 2.1	5.4
2. Personal	(25.8) 20.1	(25.6) 31.3	51.4
3. Financial	(3.7) 5.3	(3.7) 2.1	7.4
4. Illness	(5) 5.7	(4.9) 4.2	9.9
5. Left school without officially checking out	(21.5) 30.3	(21.3) 12.5	42.8
6. Going to work	(4.8) 7.4	(4.8) 2.1	9.6
7. Excessive absences	(37.2) 32.4	(36.9) 41.7	74.1
8. Lack of progress	(13) 9.4	(13) 16.7	26.1
9. Dissatisfied with school	(.4) .8	(.4) 0	.8
10. Cancel enrollment	(1.5) .8	(1.4) 2.1	2.9
11. Military service	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
12. Going to another school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
Totals	115.5	114.8	230.3

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the age group (21 - 30) in the year 1974.

Calculated Total = 19.36003.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 16.919$ .

df = 9.

$H_0$  = Rejected.

TABLE XI  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (21 - 30) FOR 1975

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(1) 2	(1) 0	2
2. Personal	(36.4) 22.2	(34.4) 48.6	70.8
3. Financial	(4) 6.5	(3.8) 1.4	7.9
4. Illness	(7.1) 6.8	(6.8) 7.1	13.9
5. Left school without officially checking out	(16.3) 26.1	(15.5) 5.7	31.8
6. Going to work	(10.4) 8.8	(9.8) 11.4	20.2
7. Excessive absences	(35.4) 38.9	(33.5) 30	68.9
8. Lack of progress	(10.8) 9.6	(10.2) 11.4	21
9. Dissatisfied with school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
10. Cancel enrollment	(.6) 1.1	(.5) 0	1.1
11. Military service	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
12. Going to another school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
Totals	122	115.6	237.6

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the age group (21 - 30) in the year 1975.

Calculated Total = 30.14174.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 15.507.$

df = 8.

$H_0$  = Rejected.

TABLE XII  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (31+) FOR 1972

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
2. Personal	(23.8) 4.3	((30.5) 50	54.3
3. Financial	(1) 2.2	(1.2) 0	2.2
4. Illness	(16) 19.6	(20.4) 16.7	36.3
5. Left school without officially checking out	(11.5) 26.1	(14.6) 0	26.1
6. Going to work	(30.5) 19.6	(39.1) 50	69.6
7. Excessive absences	(16.8) 21.7	(21.6) 16.7	38.4
8. Lack of progress	(1.9) 4.3	(2.4) 0	4.3
9. Dissatisfied with school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
10. Cancel enrollment	(2.9) 6.5	(3.6) 0	6.5
11. Military service	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
12. Going to another school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
Totals	104.3	133.4	237.7

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the age group (31+) in the year 1972.

Calculated Total = 79.6893.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 14.067$ .

df = 7.

$H_0$  = Rejected.

TABLE XIII  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (31+) FOR 1972

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
2. Personal	(28.8) 16.5	(27.7) 40	56.5
3. Financial	(4.8) 9.4	(4.6) 0	9.4
4. Illness	(18.6) 16.5	(17.9) 20	36.5
5. Left school without officially checking out	(29.5) 24.7	(28.5) 33.3	58
6. Going to work	(3) 5.9	(2.9) 0	5.9
7. Excessive absences	(16) 24.7	(15.4) 6.7	31.4
8. Lack of progress	(7) 7.1	(6.8) 6.7	13.8
9. Dissatisfied with school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
10. Cancel enrollment	(.6) 1.2	(.6) 0	1.2
11. Military service	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
12. Going to another school	(2.4) 4.7	(2.3) 0	4.7
Totals	110.7	106.7	217.4

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the age group (31+) in the year 1973.

Calculated Total = 42.8519.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 15.507$ .

df = 8.

$H_0$  = Rejected.



TABLE XIV  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (31+) FOR 1974

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(.7) 1.3	(.6) 0	1.3
2. Personal	(28.9) 25.3	(25.9) 29.4	54.7
3. Financial	(9.8) 12.7	(8.8) 5.9	18.6
4. Illness	(27.1) 27.9	(24.3) 23.5	51.4
5. Left school without officially checking out	(6) 11.4	(5.4) 0	11.4
6. Going to work	(.7) 1.3	(.6) 0	1.3
7. Excessive absences	(32.5) 25.3	(29.1) 35.3	61.6
8. Lack of progress	(5.8) 5.1	(5.2) 5.9	11
9. Dissatisfied with school	(.7) 1.3	(.6) 0	1.3
10. Cancel enrollment	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
11. Military service	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
12. Going to another school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
Totals	111.6	100	211.6

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the age group (31+) in the year 1974.

Calculated Total = 19.4829.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 15.507.$

df = 8.

$H_0$  = Rejected.

TABLE XV  
COMPARISON OF AGE GROUP (31+) FOR 1975

Reasons given by students, counselors, or department heads for students drop- ping out of school	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
1. Disciplinary	(.3) .6	(.3) 0	.6
2. Personal	(34.3) 25.9	(37) 45.4	71.3
3. Financial	(4.4) 3.1	(4.8) 6.1	9.2
4. Illness	(10.9) 13.6	(11.8) 9.1	22.7
5. Left school without officially checking out	(18) 22.2	(19.4) 15.2	37.4
6. Going to work	(10.3) 9.3	(11.1) 12.1	21.4
7. Excessive absences	(28.6) 35.2	(30.8) 24.2	59.4
8. Lack of progress	(8.2) 4.9	(8.8) 12.1	17
9. Dissatisfied with school	(.6) 1.2	(.6) 0	1.2
10. Cancel enrollment	(2.4) 1.9	(2.5) 3.4	4.9
11. Military service	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
12. Going to another school	(0) 0	(0) 0	0
Totals	117.9	127.2	245.1

Top row of numbers in parenthesis = expected frequencies.

Bottom row of numbers = actual frequencies.

$H_0$  = There is no significant difference in reasons stated between male and female for dropping out of school in the age group (31+) in the year 1975.

Calculated Total = 15.5703.

$\chi^2_{.05} = 16.919$ .

df = 9.

$H_0$  = Accepted.

## CHAPTER V

### FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Through the years the number of full-time students who dropped out of their course of study at Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training has been very low. As a result of the low number of dropouts, very little attention was given to the problem. In the past five years, however, a greater number of full-time students have dropped out.

The purpose of this study was to collect, organize, and summarize information about dropouts in such a way that it might be used in the programs to help decrease the dropout rate at Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training.

The specific research questions related to establishing this purpose were:

1. Are there any significant differences in reasons given by students from one year to the next for dropping out of school?

2. Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing age groups?

3. Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing sexes?

4. Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing age groups and by sexes?

## Significant Findings

Research Question One: Are there any significant differences in reasons given by students from one year to the next for dropping out of school?

When the Chi-square Test was conducted on 100% of the dropouts by years which included all age groups and both sexes, the following differences were noted:

Reason number one (Disciplinary) increased from .9% in the year 1972 to 4.3% in the year 1973. The rate then dropped off to 2.9% in 1974 and down to 2.2% in 1975. The sharp rise in 1973 was accounted for by a tightening of the rules. After it was established that a firm policy was in force, the students were less prone to create disciplinary problems. The percentages for the years 1974 and 1975 indicate a possible stabilization in the number dropping out for this reason. Further analysis of the next few years needs to be conducted to substantiate this finding.

Reason number two (Personal) accounts for approximately 26% of the reasons stated by students dropping out of school. This reason has been used as a catch-all in the past and needs to be revised with subdivisions for both male and female to allow a more comprehensive insight into the reason for dropping out. A copy of the proposed revised form which was approved by the Director of Academic Affairs is shown in Appendix A.

Reason number three (Financial) served only as an indicator of the economic status of the country. As the recession progressed through late 1973 and through 1974, the percentage of students dropping out for

financial reasons increased. With the easing of the recession in 1975, fewer students dropped out for financial reasons.

Reason number four (Illness) remained at a rather stable rate throughout the test period.

Reason number five (Left School Without Officially Checking Out) increased for the year 1973, then remained stable through the test period. Methods for reducing this reason have been attempted in the past but to no avail. The high percentage of low income and low achiever students who attend this school could account for students dropping out without going through the "red tape" of officially checking out.

Reason number six (Going to Work) again reflects the trend of the economy. When jobs in the higher pay scale become less available, the younger students accept part-time jobs in order to complete their education. The increase in Federal funds also has a bearing on this reason for dropping out of school. When more money becomes available for student expenditures, they are more prone to stay in school.

Reason number seven (Excessive Absences) has steadily increased during the time span of this study. Relaxing of attendance rules in the public school systems could have set a pattern that conflicts with the standards of post-secondary education and industry. If a student has been able to miss classes without being reprimanded, it is hard to establish good attendance records at a later time.

Reason number eight (Lack of Progress) has increased during the test period. As the absentee rate increases, one would expect the lack of progress rate to increase. Also, with the increase in knowledge

required to complete the more technically oriented work areas, students find it harder to keep up with the requirements.

Reason number nine (Dissatisfied with School) has decreased during the test period. This should indicate that the school is striving to meet the needs of the students and industry.

Reason number ten (Cancel Enrollment) has decreased during the test period. With proper counseling during the high school years, students have a better understanding of technical education and the work areas offered and what is expected of them to complete their course of study.

Reason number eleven (Military Service) decreased during the study due to the elimination of the draft.

Reason number twelve (Going to Another School) decreased during this study. The reason for the decrease could be due to better counseling and a student making up his or her mind on a definite goal before starting to school at the post-secondary level.

Research Question Two: Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing age groups?

When the Chi-square Test was conducted on 100% of each age group for the years 1972-1975 it was found that there were differences in reasons stated as follows:

Reason number one (Disciplinary) indicated that the age group (17½-20) had the greatest percentage (29%) of students dropping out for this reason. The age group (21-30) decreased in percentage to 13.9% and the age group (31+) dropped to 1.9%. The reason for terminating a student's course of study due to this reason decreased with maturity.

Reason number two (Personal) remained rather stable through the differing age groups with the (17½ - 20) age group being the highest. With the modified Student Check-out Form to be initiated, this percentage should drop and give a truer perspective of the underlying facts.

Reason number three (Financial) indicates that the age group (17½ - 20) had a higher percentage of dropouts (27.6%) than the (21 - 30) age group (25.9%), but lower than the age group (31+) with 39.4%. The younger group would be more involved with dating and car payments without the time element necessary to accrue savings to supplement their needs while in school. The older group (31+) would be more involved in rearing families and meeting obligations associated with it.

Reason number four (Illness) indicated that as age increases, more problems arise in the health area. The younger age group had the least number of dropouts for this reason while the older groups had increasing problems.

Reason number five (Left School Without Officially Checking Out) remained rather constant for the age groups (17½ - 20) and (31+) but increased for the (21 - 30) age group.

Reason number six (Going to Work) again directly related to the financial area and reflected the same degree of difference.

Reason number seven (Excessive Absences) stayed within a few points of each other. There is a possibility that the reasons underlying the absences are quite different, but the total number dropping out of school for this reason in each age group remained the same.

Reason number eight (Lack of Progress) diminished with the increase in age. This would indicate that the more mature a person

becomes, the more determination is expressed to complete an educational goal.

Reason number nine (Dissatisfied with School) also decreases with the age groups. Determination to finish a course of study could be a factor along with maturity.

Reason number ten (Cancel Enrollment) remained stable for the (17½ - 20) and (31+) age groups, but increased for the (21 - 30) age group. The probability of leaving a job providing income to support a family for the uncertainty of possible income after completing a course of study could cause individuals in this age group to have second thoughts concerning going to school.

Reason number eleven (Military Service) had great effect upon the differing age groups. The (17½ - 20) age group had the highest percentage, as expected, while the (31+) age group had none.

Reason number twelve (Going to Another School) had the highest percentage in the (17½ - 20) age group with the (31+) having the next highest percentage. Without further study, it would be difficult to determine the reasoning behind the differences in the age groups.

Research Question Three: Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing sexes?

When the Chi-square Test was conducted on 100% of all students dropping out of school between the years 1972-1975 by differing sexes, the following differences were noted:

Reason number two (Personal) was used by females more than twice as much as males. This would indicate that the male is more prone to



"tell it like it is", while the female is less able to state the exact reason for dropping out.

The female is more prone to (Illness) while the male is more likely to (Leave School Without Officially Checking Out). The male had more problems with (Excessive Absences), (Dissatisfied with School), and (Going to Another School) while the female had a higher percentage in (Lack of Progress).

Research Question Four: Are there any significant differences in reasons given for dropping out of school from one year to the next by differing age groups and by sexes?

When the Chi-square Test was conducted on differing age groups and by sexes for each year in the study, it showed very little difference in reasons given for dropping out of school. This exception was noted in reason number two (Personal) where the female response was much greater than the male response.

### Conclusions

There are significant differences in reasons given by students in differing age groups and sexes for dropping out of school. By understanding these differences, counselors and administrators will be able to adjust the dropout procedure in such a way that the student could be helped before the termination procedure begins.

### Recommendations

1. Up-to-date records should be kept on reasons that cause students to drop out of school for counselor, department head, and administrative uses.

2. The Student Progress Referral Report should be utilized for attendance probation, disciplinary, and scholastic problems before they culminate in termination of the student.

3. The Student Check-out Form should be modified to include sub-topics under the reason number two (Personal) that would make it more meaningful.

4. The Student Check-out Form should be initiated with the student's counselor and discussed with him or her before submitting it to the department head to begin the checking-out process.

## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, David A.

- 1970 "A Study of Selected Characteristics and Their Relationships to Students' Success at Four Post-High School Institutions." (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University)

Astin, A. W.

- 1964 "Personal and Environmental Factors Associated with College Dropouts Among High Aptitude Students." Journal of Educational Psychology, LV, 219-227.

Berdie, R. F. and N. A. Sutter.

- 1950 "Predicting Success of Engineering Students." Journal of Educational Psychology, XLI, 184-190.

Boe, E. E.

- 1964 "The Prediction of Academic Performance of Engineering Students." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXIV, 2, 377-383.

Bradfield, L. E.

- 1967 "College Adjustment and Performance of Low-Income Freshman Males." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI, 2 (October), 123-129.

Bradshaw, O. L.

- 1968 "The Relationship of Selected Measures of Aptitude, Interest, and Personality to Academic Achievement in Engineering and Engineering Technology." (Unpub. Ed. D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University.)

Brown, F. G. and T. E. Dubois.

- 1964 "Correlates of Academic Success for High-Ability Freshman Men." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (February), 603-607.

Caskey, R. C.

- 1943 "Scholastic Achievement and Measured Interest." Journal of Applied Psychology, XXVII (Fall), 101-103.

Cowell, M. D. and N. J. Entwistle.

- 1971 "Relationships Between Personality, Study Attitudes, and Academic Performance in a Technical College." British Journal of Educational Psychology, XLI (February), 85-90.

Ewens, W. P.

- 1963 "Relationship of Interest to Aptitude by Profiles and by Interest Areas." Personnel and Guidance Journal (December), 359-363.

Gillie, Angelo C.

- 1970 "Characteristics of the Technical Institute Student." American Vocational Journal, II (March), 24-25.

Grande, P. P.

- 1964 "Persistence and Change of Educational Objectives of Engineering Freshmen." Journal of College Students Personnel, VI, 2 (December), 98-101.

Grand, P. P. and J. B. Simons.

- 1967 "Personal Values and Academic Performance Among Engineering Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (February), 585-588.

Greenwood, R. L.

- 1963 "Predicting Success in Technical Programs." Technical Education News, XXIII, 22-23.

Hall, Van Milo E.

- 1967 "The Technical Education Student." Journal of Technology, VI, 2 (Spring), n. p.

Hanson, G. R. and R. G. Taylor.

- 1970 "Interaction of Ability and Personality: Another Look at the Dropout Problem in an Institute of Technology." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XVII (November), 540-545.

Herman, L. M. and M. L. Zeigler.

- 1960 "Comparison of Academic Achievement, Aptitudes, and Interest Patterns of Two-Year Technical Students and Four-Year Degree Candidates in Engineering." Journal of Experimental Education, XXIX, 1 (September), 609-622.

Hilton, T. L. and J. H. Kern.

- 1964 "Measured Change in Personal Values." Educational and Psychological Measurements, XXIV, n. p.

Holland, J. L.

- 1959 "A Theory of Vocational Choice." Journal of Counseling Psychology, VI, 35-45.

Hyman, H. H.

- 1957 "The Value System of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification." Class Status and Power. Eds. Reinhard Bendix and Saymore Lipset. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Jacobs, P. E.

- 1957 Changing Values in College. New York: Harper.

Karn, H. W.

- 1952 "Differences in Values Among Engineering Students." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XII, 701-706.

Lindeman, Paul J.

- 1970 "A Study of Selected Non-Intellectual Variables Among Classes of Students in a College of Engineering." (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University.)

Lindsay, Carl A., Theodora Hoover, and Betsy Kepler.

- 1967 "1967 Fall Term, The Pennsylvania State University Freshman Class: Profile of Demographic Variables." University Park: Office of Student Affairs, The Pennsylvania State University.

Medsker, Leland L., and James W. Trent.

- 1965 "The Influence of Different Types of Public Higher Institutions on College Attendance from Varying Socioeconomic and Ability Levels." Cooperative Research Project No. 438. Berkeley: University of California.

Miller, A. J.

- 1966 "A Study of Engineering and Technical Institute Freshman Enrolees and Dropouts in Terms of Selected Intellectual and Non-Intellectual Factors." (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University.)

Olive, Lois.

- 1969 "Relationship of Values of Occupational Role Perceptions for Freshman and Senior Students in a College of Engineering." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XVI, 2, n.p.

Osipow, S. H., J. Ashley, and J. W. Wall.

- 1966 "Personality Types and Vocational Choice: A Test of Holland's Theory." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (September), 37-42.

Popham, W. J.

- 1967 Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row.

Rexler, A. G.

- 1960 "Personal Values and Achievement in College." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIX, 137-143.

Rightland, H.

- 1965 "Identifying Technical Institute Dropouts." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (September), 68-72.

Romine, Ben H.

- 1970 "Interaction of Learning, Personality Traits, Ability, and Environment: A Preliminary Study." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXX (Summer), 337-347.

Schroder, W. L. and G. W. Sledge.

- 1966 "Factors Related to Collegiate Academic Success." Journal of College Student Personnel, VII (March), 97-104.

Speer, G. S.

- 1948 "Vocational Interest of Engineering and Non-Engineering Students." Journal of Psychology, XXV (December), 357-363.

Stagner, F.

- 1963 "The Relation of Personality to Academic Aptitude and Achievement." Journal of Educational Research, XXVI (Sept.), 648-660.

Stewart, L. H.

- 1971 "Relationships Between Interests and Personality Scores of Occupational-Oriented Students: Interest Assessment Scales and the Omnibus Personality Inventory." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XVIII, 1 (January), 31-38.

Stinson, P. J.

- 1955 "Relationship of Certain Measures of Ability, Interest, and Personality to Achievement in the Engineering Program at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College." (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University.)

Tallmadge, G. K. and H. D. Shearer.

- 1969 "Relationships Among Learning Styles, Instructional Methods, and the Nature of Learning Experiences." Journal of Educational Psychology, LX, 3 (June), 222-230.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

- 1967 Standard Terminology for Instruction in Local and State School Systems. Third draft. Washington, D. C.: State Educational Records and Report Series: Handbook VI, p. 573.

APPENDIX A

OKLAHOMA STATE TECH EXIT SURVEY



OKLAHOMA STATE TECH EXIT SURVEY  
(Confidential Report for Administration Use Only)

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

Reason or reasons for dropping out:

- |  |     |                |
|--|-----|----------------|
| 1. Disciplinary                                | ( ) |                |
| 2. Personal                                    | ( ) |                |
| a. Family Problems                             | ( ) |                |
| b. Getting Married                             | ( ) |                |
| c. Pregnant                                    | ( ) |                |
| d. Child Care                                  | ( ) |                |
| e. Other                                       | ( ) | _____          |
|  |     | Please Explain |
| 3. Financial                                   | ( ) |                |
| 4. Illness                                     | ( ) |                |
| 5. Left School Without Officially Checking Out | ( ) |                |
| 6. Going to Work                               | ( ) |                |
| 7. Excessive Absences                          | ( ) |                |
| 8. Lack of Progress                            | ( ) |                |
| 9. Dissatisfied With School                    | ( ) |                |
| 10. Canceled Enrollment                        | ( ) |                |
| 11. Military Service                           | ( ) |                |
| 12. Going to Another School                    | ( ) |                |

APPENDIX B

STUDENT PROGRESS REFERRAL REPORT

**STUDENT PROGRESS REFERRAL REPORT**

(Confidential report from student's instructor)

--Forward in Triplicate--

TO: Head \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Department)

FROM: \_\_\_\_\_ INSTRUCTOR'S CLASS: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME: \_\_\_\_\_

RE: \_\_\_\_\_ (Student) \_\_\_\_\_ (Program of study) \_\_\_\_\_ (Classification)

Immediate referral (student sent from class)  Referral for appointment

Item(s) checked below are considered to be stumbling blocks for satisfactory progress of this student:

<input type="checkbox"/> Initiative	<input type="checkbox"/> Class preparation	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor-student relations
<input type="checkbox"/> Interest in program	<input type="checkbox"/> Class conduct	<input type="checkbox"/> Chronic tardiness
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor work habits	<input type="checkbox"/> Personal hygiene	<input type="checkbox"/> Chronic absenteeism
<input type="checkbox"/> Unwise use of class time	<input type="checkbox"/> Classwork too difficult	(total hours: _____)
<input type="checkbox"/> Assignments not turned in	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor test results	(L.D.A. _____)
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor quality of work	<input type="checkbox"/> Uncooperative	Present average rating: _____

INSTRUCTOR'S/DEPARTMENT HEAD'S ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM (OR ALTERNATE PLAN) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Signatures	Department Head	Date	Student	Date	Deadline Measurement Date
------------	-----------------	------	---------	------	---------------------------

ALTERNATE PLAN

Signatures \_\_\_\_\_

DISTRIBUTION:

Original--Dept. Files      Copy--Initiating Instr.      Copy--Student's Counselor or Agency

FINAL DISPOSITION

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Coordinator of Instructional Counselors

Please use reverse side of sheet for additional comments.

VITA<sup>2</sup>

James Grant Mayberry

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A STUDY OF FULL-TIME ADULT STUDENT DROPOUTS AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF TECHNICAL TRAINING

Major Field: Vocational - Technical and Career Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Seneca, Missouri, September 20, 1928, the son of Mr. and Mrs. James F. Mayberry.

Education: Graduated from Perry High School, Perry, Oklahoma, in May, 1946; received Bachelor of Science degree in Industrial Arts Education Engineering from Oklahoma State University in 1952.

Professional Experience: Aircraft and Engine Instructor, U.S.A.F. 1946-47; Flight Engineer, 1948-49; Field Technician, Humble Oil and Refining Company, 1952-70; Field Specialist, AMOCO Chemical Company, 1970-72; Instructor, Oklahoma State University School of Technical Training, 1973-.

Professional Organizations: Oklahoma Technical Society; American Technical Education Association, Inc.