

A COMPARISON OF JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATORS'  
PERCEPTIONS TOWARD POSTSECONDARY  
TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

BY

ROBERT V. KECK

//

Bachelor of Science in Industrial Education  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1956

Master of Industrial Education  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1957

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1978

Thesis  
1978 D  
K25c  
cop. 2





A COMPARISON OF JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATORS'  
PERCEPTIONS TOWARD POSTSECONDARY  
TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

Thesis Approved:

*Donald S. Phelps*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Lloyd D. Brigers*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Ernest W. Suggs*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Donald W. Robinson*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Donald E. Allen*  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

1016588

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. Donald S. Phillips, Committee Chairman, for his guidance and encouragement and to Dr. Wayne Lockwood for his assistance with the computer programming of the data. The investigator is also grateful to Dr. Donald W. Robinson, Dr. Donald E. Allen, Dr. Lloyd D. Briggs, and Dr. Cecil W. Dugger for their aid and counsel while serving as committee members during this study.

Special appreciation is expressed to Dr. E. T. Dunlap, Chancellor; Dr. Dan Hobbs, Vice Chancellor; and the Oklahoma State Board of Regents for Higher Education who made this study possible. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Francis Tuttle, Director, and Dr. Zed De Vaughan, Consultant, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education for financial support of this study, through the Education Professions Development Act.

Special thanks are in order to the many Oklahoma junior college presidents, deans and faculty for giving their time to complete and return questionnaires.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the debt of gratitude I owe my family and especially my wife, Wanda, for her encouragement and help and to my daughter, LaWana, and son, Robert, for their understanding.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	2
Statement of Purpose . . . . .	3
Questions Investigated . . . . .	3
Definitions of Terms . . . . .	4
Limitations . . . . .	5
Need for the Study . . . . .	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH . .	8
School Personnel and the Image of Vocational Education . . . . .	13
Summary . . . . .	18
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	19
Pre-Survey Procedures . . . . .	19
Selection of Study Participants . . . . .	19
Development of the Survey Instrument . . . . .	20
Questionnaire Validity . . . . .	25
Survey Procedures . . . . .	26
Data Analysis Procedures . . . . .	26
Statistical Analysis . . . . .	27
IV. RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS . . . . .	29
Biographical Information . . . . .	30
A Comparison of the Three Groups' Perceptions of the Prestige of Postsecondary Technical-Occupational Programs . . . . .	32
A Comparison of the Three Groups' Perceptions of the Costs of Postsecondary Technical-Occupational Programs . . . . .	40
A Comparison of the Three Groups' Perceptions of the Quality of Postsecondary Technical-Occupational Programs . . . . .	48
Additional Analyses . . . . .	51
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	56

Chapter	Page
Summary of Findings Related to Question 1 . . . . .	57
Summary of Findings Related to Question 2 . . . . .	57
Summary of Findings Related to Question 3 . . . . .	58
Conclusions . . . . .	58
Recommendations . . . . .	64
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	66
APPENDICES . . . . .	68
APPENDIX A - DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT . . . . .	69
APPENDIX B - COVER LETTER SENT WITH DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT . . . . .	74
APPENDIX C - CARD FORMAT AND 80-80 LISTING OF IBM CARDS . . . . .	76
APPENDIX D - TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL AND UNIVERSITY PARALLEL PROGRAMS OFFERED BY THE PARTICIPATING JUNIOR COLLEGES . . . . .	91

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page	
I.	Response Patterns of the Administrators, Parallel Faculty, and Technical-Occupational Faculty from the Thirteen Junior Colleges . . . . .	21
II.	Summary of Biographical Data as Reported by Administrators, Parallel Faculty Members, and Technical-Occupational Faculty Members .	31
III.	A Comparison of the Responses Made by Technical Faculty Members, Parallel Faculty Members, and Administrators to Each Questionnaire Item . . . . .	33
IV.	The Number and Percent of Lowest-Quality Program Ratings Associated with Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs . . . . .	49
V.	The Number and Percent of Highest-Quality Program Ratings Associated with University Parallel and Technical-Occupational Programs . . . . .	49
VI.	A Comparison of the Response Percentages Made by Participants from Three Educational Levels to Each Questionnaire Item . . . . .	52
VII.	A Comparison of Percentages of Males' and Females' Responses to Each Questionnaire Item . . . . .	53
VIII.	A Comparison of the Response Percentages Made by Four Age Groups to Each Questionnaire Item . . . . .	54
IX.	Summary of Program Preferences as Reported by the Three Occupational Groups on Each Prestige Question . . . . .	60
X.	Summary of Program Preferences as Reported by the Three Occupational Groups on Each Finance Question . . . . .	62

FIGURE

Figure		Page
1.	Card Format Used to Enter Coded Data . . . .	77



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Technical-occupational programs have multiplied rapidly in Oklahoma's Junior Colleges during the past ten years. In 1965, there were only 75 technical-occupational programs being operated in the Oklahoma State System of colleges and universities. During the 1975-76 academic year 380 programs were offered at 27 colleges and universities throughout the State.

The increase in numbers of programs has been accompanied by substantial increases in enrollments. Individuals of various ages and backgrounds have enrolled in these programs. It seems that the technical-occupational programs are gaining acceptance in the eyes of students and the general public.

The public image of all vocational education may be changing. For example, Shultz (1971) found that public opinions toward vocational education are generally favorable, but the general public was relatively uninformed about the specific goals and purposes of vocational education programs.

In a somewhat related study, Darby (1976) solicited parents' perceptions of technical-occupational programs as opposed to a liberal arts education. He found that upper-class parents tended to view technical-occupational programs

less favorably than middle- or lower-class parents. Darby also concluded that further research needed to be conducted concerning different groups' perceptions of technical-occupational programs at the postsecondary level.

### Statement of the Problem

The development of expanded technical and occupational offerings in Oklahoma junior colleges has had an impact upon the roles or functions of these institutions. Today there are 13 junior colleges in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education which have been designated as comprehensive institutions. The three principal functions of these institutions are to provide: university parallel programs, technical and occupational programs, and community service programs.

Program offerings, enrollments and the money allocated to these programs has increased, there is however very little information available concerning the degree of acceptance these functions have gained among the faculty, administration and staff responsible for operating the institutions.

The problem with which this study was concerned was the lack of information concerning the views of junior college administrators and faculty toward technical and occupational programs. The problem was delineated by stating a series of questions. How are postsecondary technical-occupational programs viewed by college educators? Do administrators

view the programs differently than do faculty members? Do the faculty members involved in teaching the technical-occupational programs view them differently than do other faculty members? Do educators view technical-occupational programs as being less prestigious than other academic areas? What are educators' opinions concerning the financing of technical-occupational programs? Do educators view postsecondary technical-occupational programs as being of equal or higher quality than university parallel programs? These were the primary questions investigated in the study.

#### Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess the perceptions of educators from selected Oklahoma Junior Colleges toward postsecondary technical-occupational programs. Specifically, the perceptions of junior college administrators, junior college university parallel faculty members, and junior college technical-occupational faculty members toward factors related to the prestige, cost, and quality of postsecondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs were studied.

#### Questions Investigated

The following questions were investigated in the study:

Question 1: Is there a difference among the administrators' technical-occupational faculty members' and university parallel faculty members' perceptions of the prestige of

postsecondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs?

Question 2: Is there a difference among the administrators', technical-occupational faculty members' and university parallel faculty members' perceptions of the financing (cost) of postsecondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs?

Question 3: Is there a difference among the administrators', technical-occupational faculty members' and university parallel faculty members' perceptions of the quality of postsecondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs?

#### Definitions of Terms

Several terms were defined in the study to avoid multiple interpretations. These terms were as follows:

Junior College University Parallel Faculty: Fulltime faculty members of the selected junior colleges whose primary teaching assignment was in a university parallel program.

Junior College Technical-Occupational Faculty/Program Faculty: Fulltime faculty members of the selected junior colleges whose primary teaching assignment was in a technical-occupational program.

Junior College Administrators: Fulltime personnel of selected junior colleges whose primary assignment is administration but whose secondary responsibilities may be in teaching areas. Those regarded as administrators included

the following: Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Deans, Department Chairpersons, Program Directors and/or Coordinators, Librarians, Counselors, and Student Personnel Officers.

Selected Junior Colleges: All junior colleges in Oklahoma that are part of the institutions comprising the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education: Carl Albert Junior College, Claremore Junior College, Connors State College, Eastern Oklahoma State College, El Reno Junior College, Murray State College, Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College, Northern Oklahoma College, Oscar Rose Junior College, Seminole Junior College, South Oklahoma City Junior College, Western Oklahoma State College, and Tulsa Junior College.

Technical-Occupational Program: An educational program in at least one of the selected junior colleges that is designed for immediate employment upon graduation or completion

University Parallel Programs: An educational program in the selected junior colleges that is designed to be the first two years of a four year degree program.

#### Limitations

Junior college administrators were fulltime employees of the selected junior colleges in Oklahoma who indicated that their primary assignment during the 1976-77 academic year was administration.

Junior college parallel faculty members were limited to those who were teaching fulltime at the selected

Oklahoma junior colleges during the spring semester of the 1976-77 academic year.

Junior college technical-occupational faculty members were limited to those fulltime faculty members who were teaching technical-occupational programs in the selected participating Oklahoma junior colleges during the spring semester of the 1976-77 academic year.

Measures of participants' perceptions concerning the prestige of technical-occupational programs were limited to the sixteen items contained in the data collection instrument.

Measures of participants' perceptions concerning the financing of technical-occupational programs were limited to the eighteen questions contained in Section II of the data collection instrument.

Measures of participants' perceptions concerning the quality of technical-occupational programs were limited to the program areas contained in Section III of the data collection instrument.

#### Need for the Study

Many factors influence the development of quality educational programs. Some of the more obvious factors are finances, facility, and faculty. According to Divita (1968) a less obvious but important factor is the manner in which programs are viewed by personnel in the sponsoring institutions. Positive views toward a program by those directly

responsible for program operation enhances the development of quality.

The primary responsibility for the development of quality technical-occupational programs rests with faculty and administrators. Thus, knowledge about how they view these programs could be useful in program improvement.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

This Chapter presents a synopsis of the pertinent material related to the investigation. However, this does not imply that the factors included comprise an exhaustive list.

Shultz (1971) conducted a study which was concerned with the public image of vocational and technical programs. He sought to identify the perceptions regarding several aspects of vocational and technical education as held by the public in Oklahoma

Shultz concluded that the general opinions toward vocational education programs were favorable, but the general public was relatively uninformed about the goals and purposes of vocational education programs. Schultz recommended that it would be of value to conduct research of this type to determine the attitude of school administrators, school board members, parents, and students toward vocational programs.

Ballard (1973) conducted a study which was concerned with the role and function of public junior colleges in Oklahoma as perceived by citizens, students, faculty, administrators, and trustees. The specific objectives of this study were to determine the degree of differences, if any, among the publics' perceptions of the appropriate



extent of the colleges' involvement in the various functions.

The results of this study were such that it was felt that the perceptions of the appropriate activities and function priorities of the institutions held by the publics of all the colleges with the possible exception of one were so divergent as to constitute an obstacle in the achievement of educational excellence.

Fritze (1974) conducted a study concerning the opinions of public junior colleges held by public secondary school personnel involved in advising college-bound students.

Selected conclusions and recommendations from the Fritze study were:

- (1) Positive opinions of the junior college held by Oklahoma high school personnel were related to the visitation of junior colleges where their graduates attended. Due to this apparent positive influence, it would appear to be a valuable practice for Oklahoma junior college officials to regularly invite high school personnel who assist students with college planning to the campus.
- (2) Positive opinions of the junior college held by Oklahoma high school personnel were related to regular visitation of high schools by junior college representatives.
- (3) Positive opinions of the junior college held by Oklahoma high school personnel were related to having attended junior colleges. Thus, it would appear to benefit junior colleges if more high school personnel who have attended junior colleges were assisting students with college planning (p. 10).

In a somewhat related study, Darby (1976) solicited parents' perceptions of technical-occupational programs as

opposed to a liberal arts education. He found that upper-class parents tended to view technical-occupational programs less favorably than middle- or lower-class parents.

Based upon the results of this study the following conclusions and recommendations were offered:

- (1) Upper dominion parents hold a lower regard of vocational education as an acceptable educational endeavor for their children.
- (2) Lower dominion parents hold a higher regard of vocational education as an acceptable educational endeavor for their children.
- (3) There was a discernible difference in the perception of educational values between upper dominion and lower dominion parents.
- (4) Social status does influence one's perception of education, educational programs, and what is an acceptable level of educational attainment.
- (5) Those concerned with vocational education should further investigate the implications of the social status influence of educational programs.
- (6) Additional studies should investigate parental perception of vocational education to determine if change is taking place. Specifically, if upper dominion parents' attitude toward vocational education is perhaps becoming more favorable?
- (7) Vocational education should continue to expand its total public relations program. More effort is needed to describe and inform the public regarding the broad and diversified vocational curricula and the expanding opportunities for the graduate (p. 27).

The Vocational Education Amendments of (1968) are having

a very positive effect upon the image of vocational education according to many writers. For example, Shilt (1970) enumerated some of the image changes that are taking place including the following:

- (1) Vocational education has received a vote of confidence from the United States Congress to make a major contribution to the social and economic welfare of the nation through educating persons for work.
- (2) There is a general awakening on the part of school superintendents and principals which recognizes the potential of vocational education as an educational process.
- (3) One of the most significant factors in the changing image of vocational-technical education can be found in the type and amount of research being conducted in the field.
- (4) New programs in vocational and career education are being developed for persons who have not previously benefitted from the traditional programs of vocational education.
- (5) Guidance and counseling is taking on new and added responsibilities as vocational education moves toward serving more people at all levels and stages of development. Occupational information is being given to pupils in the elementary and junior high grades, and work experience is becoming an integral part of their total education. All school personnel are becoming more and more oriented toward occupational education.
- (6) Vocational-technical educators have been alert to newer teaching devices and techniques (p. 15).

According to Shultz (1971):

Vocational education, the neglected stepchild

of the educational system, has been downgraded by the public and relegated by educators to unmotivated students. Many parents have felt that vocational education was good only for someone else's children.

As pointed out by an editorial published in the Stillwater News Press (1971):

The U. S. Office of Education estimates that half of all jobs opening up in the 1970's will require training beyond high school but less than a four-year degree.

Society is creating a large number of educated incompetents because of its unrealistic demands that a student must have a four-year degree, charges Irving Goldstein, president of Charron-Williams Systems, Inc., a leading network of commercial and technical training schools in the Southeast.

Very often when a student drops out of a four-year college program he has a feeling of failure and is completely lacking in direction.

By contrast, a student pursuing a vocational education course has a sense of immediate accomplishment, a sense of purpose. He knows what type of career he is being prepared for. The course of study is intense and the student has not time for campus protesting.

Society must stop placing a stigma on young people who don't go to college. It must stop looking down on vocational education as non-intellectual or noncreative. The entire concept of vocational education needs to be upgraded.

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (1970) stressed that vocational education in the United States suffers from a national preoccupation that everyone must go to college. Government at all levels--school administrators, teachers, parents, and students--are all guilty of the attitude that vocational education is designed

for somebody else's children.

### School Personnel and the Image of Vocational Education

Fritze (1974) indicated that educators have decided that superior schools are measured by the number of graduates who later enroll in college. Educators know that parents will support superior schools. Non-college preparatory vocational education, when available, is operated as a charitable, civic enterprise.

Guidance associations insist that occupational goals are short-term goals, and too modest for high school students. (In their view, any pursuit less than college is short-term and all vocational education is modest, Fritze, 1974).

Administration and guidance seem hopelessly confused by the terminology of "work experience," "work study," and "cooperative work education." Some guidance counselors misrepresent the objectives of industrial cooperative education to potential students (Workman, 1970).

It is essential that all school personnel, and counselors in particular, hold an image of vocational education which is accurate in terms of today's thrust in vocational education. However, this apparently is not always the case, because Hoyt (1970) found the following negative perceptions of vocational education present among counselors in all parts of the United States:

- (1) The first negative perception is one of

vocational educators' trying to turn out skilled technicians and craftsmen at the secondary-school level.

- (2) The second negative perception has resulted from what was formerly the major claimed purpose of high school vocational education-- to prepare people for gainful employment.
- (3) A third negative perception has been that vocational education has failed to offer a sufficient variety of choice to students.
- (4) A final perception held by many counselors is that vocational education exists as something separate and apart from "regular" school (pp. 41-43).

In a more positive vein, Hoyt further indicated that in spite of certain negative images held by more than a few individual counselors, the overriding image--the hopes and aspiration--which the guidance movement hold for vocational education, is positive. This "ideal" image, which is entirely consistent with the goals and objectives of the guidance movement itself, has nine aspects that deserve comment, according to Hoyt. These were as follows:

- (1) Vocational education should be seen as representing a means of expanding the spectrum of educational opportunities.
- (2) Vocational education should be seen as representing an opportunity for young people to discover and develop the special talents they possess.
- (3) Vocational education represents one aspect of the school which does, by its basic mode of operation, provide for individual differences.
- (4) Vocational education represents an opportunity to discover and reflect purposefully on the values of a work-oriented society.
- (5) Vocational education provides

opportunities for all students to experience success at some level in their educational undertakings. It is inherent in the nature of vocational education that no student ever fails completely.

- (6) Vocational education represents a meaningful and direct contact between the school and the world of work.
- (7) Secondary-school vocational education represents a different avenue by which young people can explore and make decisions regarding the need for and desirability of postsecondary training and education.
- (8) High school vocational education represents one place where students whose abilities are too low to profit from training after high school can acquire basic job skills which will enable them to become productive workers.
- (9) Vocational education represents an opportunity for young people to explore and develop basic job skills which have wide application in a variety of occupational areas (p. 42).

According to Hoyt (1970) it can be concluded that the negative image of vocational education held by many practicing counselors, as members of the public, has been created both by the practices of vocational educators and by the lack of clear thinking on the part of many counselors. The true image of vocational education, expressed in terms of its basic goals and objectives, is one which should be viewed positively by all professional counselors if optimum program effectiveness is to be attained.

A study conducted in Massachusetts (Massachusetts Vocational Educational Research Coordinating Unit, 1969), found

junior high school staff members to have favorable attitudes toward vocational education with two major exceptions: vocational education was not perceived to be a suitable experience for scholastically able students; and the occupations for which vocational students were trained were not as socially respectable as other employment alternatives.

The attitudes of junior high school staff members toward vocational education are crucial to the development of programs that meet the total educational needs of students. It might be stated that junior high school staff members differentiate between technicians and theorists and perceive vocational education as a suitable experience for tradesmen and technicians, but not for students with the ability to become theorists.

Divita (1968) found that a "low status" stereotype associated with vocational education programs and students was felt to be a serious factor which hampered the growth of vocational education programs. Vocational education students were often perceived as being stereotyped as students of low intelligence and from low income families. It was felt that improvement of programs and educating the public about vocational education would do much to remove the "low status" stereotype associated with vocational education programs and students; however, the respondents did not feel that county school systems were presently doing an adequate job of educating the public about vocational education. It was felt that vocational education programs made enough



students useful members of society to justify their cost.

Punke (1968) concluded that previously, "vocational image" reflected work involving gross muscular activity and skills which presumeably anybody could acquire.

Punke further relates that currently the business and industrial world look upon the earlier concepts of vocational education as essentially obsolete but perhaps of historical value--for clues on how to go on from where we are now. One obstacle to going on is the inferiority status implied in the vocational image that seems to be embedded in the personalities of some teachers in vocational and industrial arts education. Perhaps such teachers thus signify that their own learning and teaching experience has not developed in them a broad understanding of the role which vocational activity actually plays in a modern industrial culture.

The business and industrial community in America seems more alert than the educational community to the idea that the vocational scene is changing as rapidly as the civil rights and urbanization scene. Several aspects of the philosophy of vocational education have not changed accordingly. Does it seem realistic to infer that the philosophy and implementation of vocational education can lead in the nation's vocational development if their present rate of advance leaves them in the trail of dust as industry and technology race over the next hill (Punke, 1968)?

Punke concludes that if vocational education does not

assume leadership responsibility, it will have to be content with the "Flunky image" of its followership.

Childs (1970) concluded that jobs are made by industry not by schools. Too many educators isolate themselves in the classrooms and school shops and teach as they believe a subject should be taught with no consideration of industry, its changes, or its needs for training in new techniques of service and skill development on new unit designs. Educators too often develop a "know-it-all" attitude and as a result do not communicate with industry. Also, there are those who are afraid industry will find out just how much they do not know about the subject.

#### Summary

The literature reviewed seems to be divided regarding attitudes toward vocational education. In general, the public seems to view it more favorably than do those groups, directly or indirectly connected with it. Several sources cited positive attitudes held by the public at large while school administrators and faculty were less positive and guidance counselors were the least positive of all.

The very existence of such divided attitudes among those concerned with vocational education indicates some need for more detailed study.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

#### Pre-Survey Procedures

The purpose of this study was to assess the perceptions of educators from selected Oklahoma Junior Colleges toward postsecondary technical-occupational programs. Specifically, the perceptions of junior college administrators, junior college university parallel faculty members, and junior college technical-occupational faculty members toward factors related to the prestige, cost, and quality of postsecondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs were studied.

This Chapter of the study contains an explanation of the methods and procedures used in conducting the study. Methods and procedures were divided into three areas: (1) pre-survey procedures, (2) data collection procedures, and (3) data analysis procedures.

#### Selection of Study Participants

Participants for the study were all fulltime administrators and fulltime faculty members at the thirteen Oklahoma Junior Colleges which are members of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.

The numbers of fulltime university parallel faculty members, administrators, and technical-occupational faculty members employed by each junior college during the 1976-77 academic year as indicated by college catalogs are shown in Table I.

Information from item number two of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) was used to place each respondent into one of three groups. These were; (1) administrators, (2) university parallel faculty members, and (3) technical-occupational faculty members. Data relative to technical-occupational faculty members', parallel faculty members', and administrators' job responsibilities were used to assign each participant to one of the three groups. Those individuals who indicated their primary assignment was administration were placed in the administrator's group. Faculty members whose teaching assignments were in one of the technical-occupational programs were placed in the technical-occupational faculty group. All other faculty members were placed in the university parallel faculty group.

#### Development of the Survey Instrument

A survey instrument was developed by determining the categories or types of information sought and then formulating a number of questions under each category. A copy of the Educational Survey is presented in Appendix A.

The areas or types of questions were classified as follows:

TABLE I  
 RESPONSE PATTERNS OF THE ADMINISTRATORS, PARALLEL FACULTY,  
 AND TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL FACULTY FROM  
 THE THIRTEEN JUNIOR COLLEGES

Junior College	Number of Questionnaires #Sent * #Ret.		Number of Usable Responses by Group			Number of Unusable Responses	Total Number of Responses	Percent of Return **
			University Parallel Faculty	Technical-Occupational Faculty	Administrators			
1. Carl Albert Jr. College	22	20	11	3	6	0	20	91%
2. Claremore Jr. College	68	58	25	3	15	15	58	85%
3. Connors State College	57	42	21	13	8	0	42	74%
4. Eastern Oklahoma State Col.	86	63	26	22	15	0	63	73%
5. El Reno Jr. College	33	32	21	4	7	0	32	97%
6. Murray State College	66	38	14	15	9	0	38	58%
7. Northeastern Okla. A & M	106	71	36	18	17	0	71	67%
8. Northern Oklahoma Col.	61	42	16	19	6	1	42	69%
9. Oscar Rose Jr. College	154	87	39	21	26	1	87	56%
10. Seminole Jr. College	62	40	20	10	10	0	40	65%
11. South O. C. Jr. College	105	83	33	23	23	4	83	79%
12. Western Oklahoma State Col.	39	34	19	7	8	0	34	87%
13. Tulsa Jr. College	145	83	31	28	24	0	83	57%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,004</b>	<b>693</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>693</b>	<b>69.0%</b>

\* Number sent was determined by the personnel listings in the college catalogs.

\*\* Percent of return was calculated from the total number of responses.

- (1) Biographical Information
- (2) Section I: Program Prestige
- (3) Section II: Program Financing
- (4) Section III: Program Quality
- (5) Individual Comments

The biographical information section included level of educational attainment, present assignment, sex, age, and past experiences. This information was used to develop a brief description of study respondents and to provide categories for data analysis.

Sixteen questionnaire items were used to assess perceptions of program prestige. Each participant was asked to choose between "technical-occupational programs" or "university parallel programs" in response to each of the 16 items related to prestige.

Potential respondents for this study were employees of institutions which officially gives equal status to "technical-occupational" and "university parallel" programs. It was expected that the use of a forced choice instrument would reduce the response rate. This technique should, however, determine whether the respondents view one program as having more prestige than the other. If respondents viewed the two programs equally, could not make a conscious choice and used a random method to select responses, the responses for any group would be approximately equally divided between "technical-occupational" and "university parallel" programs. If, however, the respondents did

consciously choose one program over the other the responses for any group would not necessarily be equally divided between "technical-occupational" and "university parallel" programs. Any differences between the responses rates would reflect differences in perceptions of prestige.

The sixteen items in this section of the instrument were related to several aspects of program prestige. Items 1 and 14 were related to ability. The two items were, however, considered to be opposites. For example, the program chosen as the response to item 1 "which requires more academic ability?" is considered to be of higher prestige than the program not chosen. (Table III) The program chosen as the response to item 14 would, however, be considered to be of lower prestige than the program not chosen.

Items 2-6 were related to program outcomes. The program chosen in response to each of these items was considered to be of higher prestige than the program not chosen.

Items 7, 8, and 9 were items of a personal nature. Again the program chosen in response to each of these items was considered to be of higher prestige than the program not chosen.

Items 10,11, and 12 were concerned with social class. The program chosen in response to item 10 was considered to be of lower prestige than the one not chosen. The program chosen in response to items 11 and 12 was considered to be of higher prestige than the one not chosen.

The program chosen in response to item 13 was considered

to be higher than the one not chosen. The program chosen in response to item 15 was considered to be of higher prestige than the program not chosen.

Item 16 deals directly with the issue of prestige. The program chosen in response to this item was considered to be of higher prestige than the one not chosen.

The respondents' opinions of program costs were based on 18 questionnaire items related to facilities, equipment, materials, personnel, travel, per diem, and consultants.

Program finance item one was concerned with the amount of building space needed per program.

Items two and three were concerned with program personnel requirements.

Student support services, such as transportation, counseling, guidance, and health care were the essence of item four.

Items five and nine were concerned with community support and contacts within the community.

Items six and seven were concerned with special qualifications required for each type of program's faculty and administration.

Item eight was concerned with the amount of non-professional support staff needed by each type of program, while item 10 was related to student recruiting.

Items 11, 12, 13, and 14 were concerned with the amount of teaching materials, supplies, equipment, and library facilities required by each type of program.



Items 15, 16, and 17 were related to the costs of travel and per diem for administrators, faculty, and students.

Item 18 was a direct question concerning the type of program which required the most money per student. The final question was actually a summary of the previous 17 questions. The program chosen in response to these items would be more expensive than the program not chosen.

A third questionnaire area, Program Quality, was unique to each institution. A separate instrument for each institution was developed by listing technical-occupational and university parallel programs offered by each junior college.

Individual estimates of program quality were determined by having each participants place an "H" by the three highest quality programs and an "L" by the three lowest quality programs at their institution. The highest-quality and lowest-quality rankings or choices were then tabulated for the university parallel and technical-occupational programs at each junior college.

The final section of the questionnaire was a space for making subjective comments and observations about the previous sections.

#### Questionnaire Validity

The content validity of the questionnaire was established by the consensual or jury method. Copies of the

questionnaire were distributed to all five members of the Doctoral Committee. Each member was asked to determine whether the questions being asked would, in fact, solicit the kind of information needed in the study. Committee suggestions and changes in format or items were incorporated in the final instrument.

### Survey Procedures

The following procedures were followed in conducting the mail survey.

Surveys were mailed to the presidents of the participating colleges. These presidents, in turn, gave the materials to their chief academic officers for distribution and collection.

The data presented in Table I show that a total of 693 responses were received yielding a response rate of 69.0 percent. However, 21 of the responses were unusable, and this lowered the actual response rate to 672 or 66.93 percent. The highest percent of returns was received from El Reno Junior College (97%), while the lowest percent of returns was from Oscar Rose and Tulsa Junior Colleges, 56 percent and 57 percent respectively.

### Data Analysis Procedures

Quantitative values were assigned to the participants' responses and entered on cards for further processing. A copy of the card format and the raw data are presented in

## Appendix C.

Statistical Analysis

Next the response to each "prestige" and "cost" item of the questionnaire were analyzed by generating frequency counts for several categories. These categories and the groups within each category are shown as follows:

- a. Highest Degree Earned
  - i. Doctorate
  - ii. Masters
  - iii. Educational Specialist
  - iv. Bachelor's
  - v. Associate
  - vi. Certificate or "Other"
- b. Institutional Assignment
  - i. Technical-Occupational Faculty
  - ii. University Parallel Faculty
  - iii. Administrator
- c. Age
  - i. 20-30
  - ii. 31-40
  - iii. 41-50
  - iv. 51-60
  - v. Over 61
- d. Sex
  - i. Male
  - ii. Female
- e. Professional Experience
  - i. College experience in teaching, research, administration, or a related academic staff position:  
At this institution

The chi square statistic was used to test for differences among or between groups in each category. This test is most appropriate for nominal level data.

The statistical package for the social sciences currently operational at the Oklahoma State University computer

center was used to generate frequency counts and chi square analysis.

Frequency counts of the programs listed as being of "highest" and "lowest" quality by position were generated. The chi square statistic was used to test for differences among the three groups.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to assess the perceptions of educators from selected Oklahoma Junior Colleges toward postsecondary technical-occupational programs. Specifically, the perceptions of junior college administrators, junior college university parallel faculty members, and junior college technical-occupational faculty members toward factors related to the prestige, cost, and quality of postsecondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs were studied.

In this study, 672 administrators, technical-occupational faculty members, and university parallel faculty members from 13 junior colleges in Oklahoma responded to a Program Survey Questionnaire in an attempt to determine if there were any differences among the administrators' (N=174), parallel faculty members' (N=312), and technical-occupational faculty members' (N=186) perceptions of the prestige, financing, and quality of postsecondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs. Three general questions were studied in comparing the three groups' responses to three questionnaire areas. Secondary comparisons were also made among the three groups' (1)

educational levels, (2) ages, and (3) gender. Participants' comments were also presented and analyzed.

This Chapter contains the results of investigating all research questions as well as secondary findings.

### Biographical Information

The participants' educational level, sex, age, and professional experience are presented in Table II. These data show that the administrators had the highest level of education, parallel faculty members had the second highest educational level, and technical-occupational faculty members had the least amount of education.

There was a difference among the percentages of males and females in the three groups. There were more males among the administrators than among the two faculty groups.

Ages of the three groups of participants were different. Administrators were older than either of the faculty groups and the university parallel faculty members were older than the technical-occupational faculty members.

Parallel faculty members reported the greatest amount of experience at the institution. Administrators reported exactly six years average experience, while technical-occupational faculty members showed an average of less than five and one-half years experience.

PLEASE NOTE:

Dissertation contains small  
and indistinct print.  
Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

TABLE II  
 SUMMARY OF BIOGRAPHICAL DATA AS REPORTED BY ADMINISTRATORS, PARALLEL  
 FACULTY MEMBERS, AND TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL FACULTY MEMBERS

		Technical- Occupational faculty members (N = 186)	Parallel faculty members (N = 312)	Administrators (N = 174)
EDUCATION LEVEL	Doctorate	3	33	41
	Master's Degree	128	257	112
	Education Specialist	3	1	3
	Bachelor's Degree	44	19	13
	Associate Degree	2	1	2
	Certificate or Other	4	1	3
	Non-respondents	2	0	0
Totals		186	312	174
SEX	Males	56%	63%	71%
	Females	38%	33%	25%
	Non-respondents	6%	4%	4%
Totals		100%	100%	100%
AGE	$\bar{X}$ = 37.54	$\bar{X}$ = 38.37	$\bar{X}$ = 39.96	
	S = 8.17	S = 10.12	S = 9.22	
YEARS AT PRESENT INSTITUTION	$\bar{X}$ = 5.437	$\bar{X}$ = 6.502	$\bar{X}$ = 6.000	
	S = 10.221	S = 9.173	S = 8.347	



A Comparison of the Three Groups' Per-  
ceptions of the Prestige of  
Postsecondary Technical-  
Occupational Programs

The responses to each questionnaire item were analyzed by calculating the frequencies and percentages. The chi square statistic was used to test for differences among the three groups. The results of these analyses are shown in Table III.

All three groups felt that the university parallel programs required more academic ability. Percentages of each group choosing the university parallel programs ranged from a low of 81.6 percent for the technical-occupational faculty members to a high of 98 percent for the university parallel faculty members.

All three groups felt that university parallel programs would yield a better general education. Percentages of the three groups expressing this opinion were technical-occupational faculty members, 81.6 percent; university parallel faculty members, 94.5 percent; and administrators, 91.8 percent.

There were differences of opinion among the three groups as to which type of program led to a better occupation. Over sixty percent (62.2%) of the technical-occupational faculty members preferred the technical-occupational programs, while 74.3 percent of the university parallel faculty

TABLE III

A COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSES MADE BY TECHNICAL FACULTY MEMBERS,  
PARALLEL FACULTY MEMBERS, AND ADMINISTRATORS  
TO EACH QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM

WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM . . .	Technical Faculty (N = 186)		Parallel Faculty (N = 312)		Administrators (N = 174)		$\chi^2$	Significance Level
	Technical	Parallel	Technical	Parallel	Technical	Parallel		
1. requires more academic ability?	18.4	81.6	2.0	98.0	9.3	90.7	40.45	p < .0001
2. gives a better general education?	18.4	81.6	5.5	94.5	8.2	91.8	22.20	p < .0001
3. leads to a better occupation?	62.2	37.8	25.7	74.3	41.2	58.8	62.48	p < .0001
4. leads to more job opportunities?	68.3	31.7	43.8	56.2	56.6	43.4	28.03	p < .0001
5. leads to more job satisfaction?	68.7	31.3	23.2	76.8	42.1	57.9	94.36	p < .0001
6. leads to more job advancement?	47.0	53.0	18.0	82.0	18.5	81.5	55.60	p < .0001
7. would you advise for your son?	51.4	48.6	11.5	88.5	27.2	72.8	88.45	p < .0001
8. would you advise for your daughter?	49.7	50.3	8.9	91.1	23.2	76.8	99.80	p < .0001
9. would you prefer?	48.6	51.4	5.4	94.6	20.0	80.0	125.93	p < .0001
10. is better for students in the working class?	93.7	6.3	76.2	23.8	80.2	19.8	23.15	p < .0001
11. is better for students in middle class?	60.6	39.4	25.2	74.8	47.2	52.8	59.53	p < .0001
12. is better for students in wealthy class?	23.4	76.6	4.9	95.1	13.5	86.5	34.25	p < .0001
13. is better for most students?	71.5	28.5	28.2	71.8	47.6	52.4	83.64	p < .0001
14. is better for students with limited ability?	88.3	11.7	92.3	7.7	92.0	8.0	2.45	p > .05
15. do you feel is more important?	61.0	39.0	16.3	83.7	35.6	64.4	97.43	p < .0001
16. do you feel is most prestigious?	12.4	87.6	2.7	97.3	4.2	95.8	19.96	p < .0001
WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM REQUIRES . . .								
1. more building space per program?	87.9	12.1	84.8	15.2	90.6	9.4	3.43	p > .05
2. more faculty per 100 students?	88.6	11.4	84.8	15.2	90.6	9.4	3.76	p > .05
3. more administrative personnel?	49.7	50.3	45.7	54.3	49.4	50.6	0.93	p > .05
4. more student support services?	61.5	38.5	45.2	54.8	48.2	51.8	12.20	p < .05
5. community support?	84.5	15.5	69.0	31.0	79.6	20.4	16.29	p < .001
6. more special qualifications for faculty?	76.5	23.5	46.2	53.8	67.1	32.9	47.39	p < .0001
7. more special qualifications for administrators?	53.0	47.0	29.9	70.1	51.5	48.5	32.62	p < .0001
8. more nonprofessional support staff?	69.8	30.2	68.2	31.8	66.1	33.9	0.57	p > .05
9. more contacts in the community?	89.6	10.4	79.8	20.2	84.0	16.0	7.97	p < .05
10. more student recruiting?	82.5	17.5	60.1	39.9	72.2	27.8	27.31	p < .0001
11. more specialized equipment?	95.7	4.3	91.6	8.4	94.1	5.9	3.17	p > .05
12. more supervised laboratory work?	93.4	6.6	82.6	17.4	86.5	13.5	11.40	p < .01
13. more teaching materials/supplies?	89.6	10.4	78.6	21.4	82.7	17.3	9.41	p < .01
14. more library facilities?	21.9	78.1	5.0	95.0	10.7	89.3	32.56	p < .0001
15. more travel by administrators?	54.5	45.5	49.7	50.3	58.0	42.0	3.10	p > .05
16. more travel by faculty?	68.5	31.5	50.7	49.3	60.4	39.6	15.00	p < .001
17. more program related travel by the student?	77.0	23.0	72.2	27.8	83.6	16.4	7.72	p < .05
18. more money per student?	80.3	19.7	74.5	25.5	84.6	15.4	6.94	p < .05

\*The total number of respondents for each group is shown in the column headings. Each respondent did not however respond to each questionnaire item. The numbers shown in the columns are percentages of the numbers responding to the respective items. The lowest percent of responses (92.1%) was made to prestige item #10.

members and 58.8 percent of the administrators felt that university parallel programs would lead to better occupation.

As far as job opportunities, most of the technical-occupational faculty members (68.3%) and administrators (56.6%) felt that technical-occupational programs would yield more job opportunities. However, most of the university parallel faculty members (56.2%) felt that university parallel programs would lead to more job opportunities.

Job satisfaction was the next area of consideration. Most of the university parallel faculty members (76.8%) and administrators (57.9%) felt that university parallel programs would lead to more job satisfaction than technical-occupational programs, but more than two-thirds (68.7%) of the technical-occupational faculty members felt that technical-occupational programs would yield the most job satisfaction. The majority of all three groups agreed that university parallel programs would lead to more job advancement than technical-occupational programs. Of the technical-occupational faculty members, 53 percent held this opinion, while 82 percent of the university parallel faculty members and 81.5 percent of the administrators were in agreement.

The next three questionnaire areas were concerned with the respondents' program preferences for their children and themselves. Interestingly enough, the majority of all three groups preferred university parallel programs for their daughters (technical-occupational faculty members, 50.3

percent; university parallel faculty members 91.1 percent; and administrators, 76.8 percent). On the other hand, a majority of the technical-occupational faculty members preferred technical-occupational programs for their sons (51.4%), but 88.5 percent university parallel faculty members and 72.8 percent of the administrators preferred university parallel programs for their sons. All three groups felt that the technical-occupational programs were more advisable for their sons than for their daughters.

A majority of all three groups chose university parallel programs as their personal preference. The highest percentage was with the university parallel faculty members (94.6%), while 80 percent of the administrators and 51.4 percent of the technical-occupational faculty members preferred the university programs.

The next questionnaire area was concerned with type of educational program and socioeconomic level. All three groups felt that technical-occupational programs were better for working class students. Percentages for each group were as follows: technical-occupational faculty members, 93.7 percent; university parallel faculty members, 76.2 percent; and administrators, 72.8 percent.

Prestige question number thirteen was actually a summary of the three previous items. Nearly seventy-two percent (71.8%) of the university parallel faculty members and 52.4 percent of the administrators felt that university parallel programs were better than technical-occupational programs

for most students. However, 71.5 percent of the technical-occupational faculty members felt that technical-occupational programs were better for most students and only 28.5 percent felt that university parallel programs were better for most students.

The majority of all three groups felt that technical-occupational programs were better for students of limited ability. Percentages of each group favoring the technical-occupational programs were as follows:

technical-occupational faculty members, 88.3 percent;  
university parallel faculty members, 92.3 percent; and  
administrators, 92 percent.

Participants were asked to compare the overall importance of technical-occupational and university parallel programs. A majority of the university parallel faculty members (83.7%) and administrators (64.4%) felt that university parallel programs were more important. On the other hand, only 39 percent of the technical-occupational faculty members felt that the university parallel programs were more important than the technical-occupational programs.

The final prestige question required participants to choose the type of program which they felt was more prestigious. All three groups overwhelmingly selected the university parallel programs as the most prestigious. Percentages of each group selecting the university parallel programs were as follows: technical-occupational faculty members, 87.6 percent; university parallel faculty members,

97.3 percent; and administrators, 95.8 percent.

The chi square results presented in Table III show that there were differences among the three groups' responses in all cases except one. There was no difference among the three groups' responses concerning the type of program which is best for students of limited ability. All groups felt that technical-occupational programs were better for students of limited ability.

Although the three groups' responses to all other prestige questions were different, responses to some questions showed more diversity than others. For example, 80 percent of the administrators and 94.6 percent of the university parallel faculty members chose university parallel programs as their personal preference, while only 51.4 percent of the technical-occupational faculty members indicated a personal preference for university parallel programs over technical-occupational programs. This item reflected the greatest discrepancy of opinion among the three groups.

The area which showed the second greatest amount of diversity among ratings was concerned with the type of program most advisable for the respondents' daughters. Over ninety percent (91.1%) of the university parallel faculty members felt that university parallel programs were more advisable for their daughters, and 76.8 percent of the administrators were in agreement with the university parallel faculty preferences. On the other hand, only 50.3 percent of the technical-occupational faculty members indicated that

university parallel programs were more advisable for their daughters than technical-occupational programs.

The subtleties of the program preferences indicated by the three groups' for their siblings and themselves are limitless. However, there are two which need further explanation.

First, program preferences showed that all three groups felt that technical-occupational programs were more advisable for their sons than for their daughters. There is no logical explanation for this discrepancy, but may be the result of having more and higher quality technical-occupational program available for male participants. Another possible explanation would be that employment in skills areas does not afford as many job opportunities or advancement opportunities for females as males.

The second discrepancy which should be cited was differences among program preferences for their children and program preferences as advisable for themselves. The majority of all three groups felt that university parallel programs would be more advisable for them than technical-occupational programs. While there was only a slight majority of the technical-occupational faculty members who preferred the university parallel programs over technical-occupational programs (51.4%), the critical analyst must wonder if technical-occupational faculty members are thoroughly convinced of the merit and long-term effectiveness of postsecondary technical-occupational programs.

Another observation which should be made is that faculty members, both technical-occupational and university parallel, may prefer university parallel programs because they feel that job opportunities afforded by the technical-occupational programs are not as important as having a general education.

One section of the questionnaire was reserved for participants' comments concerning program prestige. These comments may be summarized as follows.

Nearly all of the 216 comments on Section I were directed toward the participants' inability and/or willingness to respond to the questionnaire items 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12.

- (5) Which type of education program leads to more job satisfaction?
- (7) Which type of education program would you advise for your son?
- (8) Which type of education program would you advise for your daughter?
- (10) Which type of education program is better for working class students?
- (11) Which type of education program is better for middle class students?
- (12) Which type of education program is better for wealthy class students?



A Comparison of the Three Groups'  
Perceptions of the Costs of  
Postsecondary Technical-  
Occupational Programs

The analysis of perceptions of program costs was accomplished by comparing the frequencies and percentages calculated for each group. A chi square statistic was used to test for differences among the three groups' responses. Results of these analyses are presented in the second part of Table III.

A majority of all three groups felt that technical-occupational programs required more building space per program than university parallel programs. Of the technical-occupational faculty members, 87.9 percent felt that technical-occupational programs required more building space than university parallel programs, while 84.8 percent of the university parallel faculty members and 90.6 percent of the administrators shared the same opinion.

Along the same line, 88.6 percent of the technical-occupational faculty members, 84.8 percent of the university parallel faculty members, and 90.6 percent of the administrators felt that technical-occupational programs required more faculty per 100 students than university parallel programs. This is probably because of the small classes usually associated with technical-occupational programs.

Somewhat of a paradox was noted on the next

questionnaire item. The majority of all three groups indicated that university parallel programs required more administrative personnel than technical-occupational programs even though technical-occupational programs required more faculty per 100 students. This question may have been interpreted in two different ways which could cause some discrepancy. Technical-occupational programs may require fewer administrative personnel simply because there are fewer technical-occupational programs than university parallel programs. A second interpretation could be that the technical-occupational programs require fewer administrative personnel per 100 students than university parallel programs. Percentages of all three groups who saw more administrative personnel for university parallel programs than technical-occupational programs were slightly above 50 percent. Percentages for the three groups were as follows: technical-occupational faculty members, 50.3 percent; university parallel faculty members, 54.3 percent; and administrators, 50.6 percent.

Participants were asked to indicate which type program they felt required more student support services. Over sixty percent (61.5%) of the technical-occupational faculty members felt that technical-occupational programs required more student personnel services than university parallel programs. On the other hand, 54.8 percent of the university parallel faculty members and 61.8 percent of the administrators felt that university parallel programs required more

student personnel services than technical-occupational programs.

The next area to be considered was that of community support. An overwhelming majority of all three groups felt that technical-occupational programs required more community support than university parallel programs. The highest percentage (84.5%) was noted for the technical-occupational faculty members, while 79.6 percent of the administrators and 69 percent of the university parallel faculty members shared the same opinion.

Participants were asked to indicate which type of program they felt would require more special qualifications for faculty members. Over three-fourths (76.5%) of the technical-occupational faculty members and over two-thirds (67.1%) of the administrators felt that technical-occupational programs required more special faculty qualifications than university parallel programs. However, slightly more than one-half (53.8%) of the university parallel faculty members felt that university parallel programs required more special qualifications for faculty members than technical-occupational programs.

A similar question was asked concerning the type of program which required more special qualifications for administrators. In this case, there was a tendency toward the university parallel programs, but opinions were about equally divided for both the technical-occupational faculty members and the administrators. Fifty-three percent (53%)

of the technical-occupational faculty members and 51.5 percent of the administrators felt that technical-occupational programs required more special qualifications for administrators than university parallel programs. At the same time, 70.1 percent of the university parallel faculty members felt that university parallel programs required more special qualifications for administrators than technical-occupational programs.

Another area of program expense is classified as non-professional support staff. The three groups were asked to indicate the type of program they felt required more non-professional support staff. Approximately two-thirds of all three groups felt that technical-occupational programs required more nonprofessional support staff than university parallel programs. Of the technical-occupational faculty members, 69.8 percent selected technical-occupational programs, while 68.2 percent of the university parallel faculty members and 66.1 percent of the administrators were of the same opinion.

The next questionnaire area was concerned with the number of community contacts. This is essential to all technical-occupational programs because of the information sought in needs assessments; consultation, equipment and training materials furnished by business and industry; and the training and employment opportunities offered by local businesses. The majority of all three groups agreed that technical-occupational programs required more community

contacts than university parallel programs. Percentages of the three groups who expressed this opinion were as follows: technical-occupational faculty members, 89.6 percent; university parallel faculty members, 79.8 percent; and administrators, 84 percent.

Student recruiting can be an area of additional program expense, especially if faculty and student travel is involved. Participants were asked to indicate the type of program which they felt required more student recruiting. All three groups felt that technical-occupational programs required more student recruiting. Over eighty percent (82.5%) of the technical-occupational faculty members, 60.1 percent of the university parallel faculty members, and 72.2 percent of the administrators felt that technical-occupational programs required more student recruiting than university parallel programs. Percentages reported by the university parallel faculty were lower than those reported by technical-occupational faculty members and administrators.

Specialized equipment was the next area rated by the three groups of participants. Over ninety percent of all three groups felt that technical-occupational programs required more specialized equipment than university parallel programs. The highest group percentage was reported for technical-occupational faculty members (95.7%). This was compared to 94.1 percent of the administrators and 91.6 percent of the university parallel faculty members. These results came as no surprise, because specialized equipment

program requiring more specialized equipment. All three groups indicated that technical-occupational programs required more specialized equipment than university parallel programs.

Participants were asked to indicate the type of program which they felt required more library facilities. Undoubtedly, library facilities are associated with university parallel programs more than technical-occupational programs, because 78.1 percent of the technical-occupational faculty members, 95 percent of the university parallel faculty members, and 89.3 percent of the administrators indicated that university parallel programs require more library facilities than technical-occupational programs.

The next three questionnaire items were concerned with the amount of administrator, faculty, and student travel associated with each type of program. A majority of the technical-occupational faculty members (54.5%) and administrators (58%) felt that technical-occupational programs required more administrator travel than university parallel programs. However, only 50.3 percent of the university parallel faculty members shared the same opinion.

Differences in opinion concerning the program which required more faculty travel were much more pronounced. A majority of all three groups felt that the technical-occupational programs required more faculty travel than university parallel programs. Over two-thirds (68.5%) of the technical-occupational faculty members, 50.7 percent

of the university parallel faculty members, and 60.4 percent of the administrators felt that technical-occupational programs required more faculty travel than university parallel programs. Additional faculty travel could be a source of program expense.

A majority of all three groups felt that student travel was more a part of technical-occupational programs than university parallel programs. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of the technical-occupational faculty members, 72.2 percent of the university parallel faculty members, and 83.6 percent of the administrators felt that technical-occupational programs required more student travel than university parallel programs.

The issue of staff and student travel may be summarized by saying that in most cases, technical-occupational faculty members, university parallel faculty members, and administrators felt that technical-occupational programs required more administrative, faculty, and student travel than university parallel programs.

The final program costs question was intended to determine directly the three groups' opinions as to which type of program was considered most expensive. The overwhelming majority of all three groups agreed that technical-occupational programs were more expensive than university parallel programs. The percentages of each group who selected the technical-occupational programs as being more expensive were as follows: technical-occupational faculty

members, 80.3 percent; university parallel faculty members, 74.5 percent; and administrators, 84.6 percent. These results came as no surprise when the results of the previous seventeen questionnaire items were summarized. All three groups agreed that technical-occupational programs required: (1) more building space per program, (2) more faculty per 100 students, (3) more student support services, (4) more nonprofessional support staff, (5) more student recruiting, (6) more contacts in the community, (7) more specialized equipment, (8) more supervised laboratory work, (9) more teaching materials and supplies, (10) more faculty travel, and (11) more student travel than university parallel programs. All these areas require at least some monetary support and some are quite expensive. This would account for the final conclusion by most participants that technical-occupational programs are more expensive than university parallel programs.

Most of the 235 comments on Section II were directed toward the lack of response patterns. The two specific comments made most often were (1) there needed to be at least a 5-point continuum for responses and (2) one response needed to be "not sure or no opinion."

The few comments which were related to the content of the questionnaire generally conceded that technical-occupational programs were more expensive than university parallel programs because of the extra equipment and facilities needed for technical-occupational programs.



A Comparison of the Three Groups Per-  
ceptions of the Quality of  
Postsecondary Technical-  
Occupational Programs

The third research question was concerned with the quality of postsecondary technical-occupational programs as compared to university parallel programs. Respondents from each participating junior college were asked to indicate the three programs which they considered to be the highest quality at their institutions and the three programs which they considered to be the lowest quality. This resulted in six rankings made by each participant. Rankings were then categorized as technical-occupational programs or university parallel programs. Comparisons of the number and percent of lowest-quality and highest-quality program ratings associated with the technical-occupational and university parallel programs are presented in Tables IV and V.

The results presented in Table IV show that a majority (57.6 percent of the total) of the lowest-quality program ratings were associated with the university parallel programs. Over forty percent (44.5%) of the technical-occupational faculty members lowest-quality program ratings, 53.6 percent of the university parallel faculty members' lowest-quality program ratings, and 59.6 percent of the administrators' lowest-quality program ratings were associated with

TABLE IV

THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF LOWEST-QUALITY PROGRAM RATINGS ASSOCIATED WITH TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL AND UNIVERSITY PARALLEL PROGRAMS

	Lowest-Quality Program Ratings Made of Technical-Occupational Programs		Lowest-Quality Program Ratings Made of University Parallel Programs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Technical-Occupational Faculty	272	54.5	227	45.5
University Parallel Faculty	309	36.4	541	63.6
Administrators	195	40.4	288	59.6
TOTALS . . .	776	42.4	1,056	57.6

$$\chi^2 = 43.936; df=2; p < .001$$

TABLE V

THE NUMBER AND PERCENT OF HIGHEST-QUALITY PROGRAM RATINGS ASSOCIATED WITH UNIVERSITY PARALLEL AND TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

	Highest-Quality Program Ratings Made of Technical-Occupational Programs		Highest-Quality Program Ratings Made of University Parallel Programs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Technical-Occupational Faculty	381	71.6	151	28.4
University Parallel Faculty	207	23.2	684	76.8
Administrators	243	50.4	239	49.6
TOTALS . . .	831	43.6	1,074	56.4

$$\chi^2 = 330.02; df=2; p < .001$$

university parallel programs.

The results presented in Table V show that 43.6 percent of the highest-quality program ratings were associated with technical-occupational programs, while 56.4 percent of the highest-quality program ratings were associated with the university parallel programs. The greatest percent of highest-quality program ratings was made by the university parallel faculty members of university parallel programs (76.8%). On the other hand, technical-occupational faculty members highest-quality program ratings were associated with technical-occupational programs 71.6 percent of the time. Administrators' highest-quality program ratings were slightly more frequent with the technical-occupational programs (50.4%), but the 49.6 percent of highest-quality program ratings associated with university parallel programs was not lower.

It should be noted that a comparison of the data presented in Tables IV and V will show that a majority of the lowest-quality program ratings and highest-quality program ratings were both associated with the university parallel programs.

Approximately nine percent of the participants did not respond to Section III of the questionnaire. The most common reasons given for non-response were as follows: (1) participants had no way of judging the quality of the programs and (2) participants refused to acknowledge that some programs were of lower quality than others.

Many other comments (N=84) were too vague and esoteric to be of any value to the study. Most of these comments were an attempt to explain the philosophy and long-range goals of the junior college.

#### Additional Analyses

In addition to the comparison of ratings made by participants from three occupational groups within each junior college, comparisons were made on other variables believed to be related to the perception of postsecondary technical-occupational programs. Comparisons were made among responses made by participants from three levels of educational training, both sexes, and four age categories. These data are summarized in Table VI, VII, and VIII. While the results of these comparisons were interesting, it should be noted that the additional comparisons simply resulted in a verification of findings presented in Table III. This was because of the duplication of comparison categories. For example, original comparisons were made among technical-occupational faculty members, university parallel faculty members, and administrators. Secondary comparisons were made among participants who had doctorates, masters degrees, and bachelors degrees. The second categories proved to be almost a duplication of the first in that most doctorates were administrators, most of the masters degree people were university parallel faculty members, and most of the bachelor degree people were technical-occupational faculty members.

TABLE VI

A COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSE PERCENTAGES MADE BY PARTICIPANTS  
FROM THREE EDUCATIONAL LEVELS TO EACH QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	Doctorate (N = 82)		Master's (N = 491)		Bachelor's (N = 75)		X <sup>2</sup>	Significance Level
	Technical	Parallel	Technical	Parallel	Technical	Parallel		
<b>WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM . . .</b>								
1. requires more academic ability?	10.1*	89.9*	7.7*	92.3*	10.8*	89.2*	1.18	p > .05
2. gives a better general education?	7.3	92.7	8.8	91.2	17.3	82.7	6.08	p < .05
3. leads to a better occupation?	37.2	62.8	36.7	63.3	59.2	40.8	13.25	p < .01
4. leads to more job opportunities?	60.3	39.7	49.6	50.4	74.6	25.4	17.17	p < .001
5. leads to more job satisfaction?	44.4	55.6	36.5	63.5	65.8	34.2	22.70	p < .0001
6. leads to more job advancement?	20.5	79.5	25.1	74.9	37.5	62.5	6.38	p < .05
7. would you advise for your son?	23.4	76.6	23.8	76.2	47.0	53.0	16.38	p < .001
8. would you advise for your daughter?	20.3	79.7	21.7	78.3	40.9	59.1	12.40	p < .01
9. would you prefer?	13.9	86.1	18.9	81.1	40.0	60.0	19.07	p < .001
10. is better for students in the working class?	78.7	21.3	82.2	17.8	88.2	11.8	2.33	p > .05
11. is better for students in middle class?	34.7	65.3	37.9	62.1	68.1	31.9	24.09	p < .0001
12. is better for students in wealthy class?	13.2	86.8	11.9	88.1	15.9	84.1	0.93	p > .05
13. is better for most students?	47.4	52.6	41.9	58.1	66.7	33.3	15.01	p < .001
14. is better for students with limited ability?	88.5	11.5	91.6	8.4	90.1	9.9	0.89	p > .05
15. do you feel is more important?	25.3	74.7	30.2	69.8	63.9	36.1	34.44	p < .0001
16. do you feel is most prestigious?	6.3	93.8	4.2	95.8	12.7	87.3	8.67	p < .05
<b>WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM REQUIRES . . .</b>								
1. more building space per program?	90.1	9.9	87.9	12.1	79.2	20.8	5.03	p > .05
2. more faculty per 100 students?	90.2	9.8	87.0	13.0	86.5	13.5	0.72	p > .05
3. more administrative personnel?	48.1	51.9	50.5	49.5	30.0	70.0	10.30	p < .01
4. more student support services?	47.4	52.6	51.7	48.3	47.9	52.1	0.74	p > .05
5. community support?	80.2	19.8	75.4	24.6	76.1	23.9	0.90	p > .05
6. more special qualifications for faculty?	65.8	34.2	56.0	44.0	79.2	20.8	15.19	p < .001
7. more special qualifications for administrators?	45.3	54.7	40.0	60.0	45.2	54.8	1.31	p > .05
8. more nonprofessional support staff?	67.9	32.1	70.2	29.8	54.3	45.7	7.08	p < .05
9. more contacts in the community?	79.7	20.3	83.5	16.5	86.3	13.7	1.20	p > .05
10. more student recruiting?	70.5	29.5	70.5	29.5	65.8	34.2	0.69	p > .05
11. more specialized equipment?	95.1	4.9	92.8	7.2	95.9	4.1	1.41	p > .05
12. more supervised laboratory work?	88.8	11.3	86.6	13.4	86.1	13.9	0.32	p > .05
13. more teaching materials/supplies?	80.0	20.0	83.7	16.3	80.8	19.2	0.90	p > .05
14. more library facilities?	13.4	86.6	9.0	90.9	21.9	78.1	10.96	p < .01
15. more travel by administrators?	51.3	48.7	56.2	43.8	39.4	60.6	7.18	p < .05
16. more travel by faculty?	49.4	50.6	60.3	39.7	56.9	43.1	3.39	p > .05
17. more program-related travel by the student?	78.5	21.5	77.3	22.7	67.1	32.9	3.70	p > .05
18. more money per student?	88.9	11.1	79.3	20.7	67.1	32.9	11.04	p < .01

\*The total number of respondents for each group is shown in the column headings. Each respondent did not, however, respond to each questionnaire item. The numbers shown in the columns are percentages of the numbers responding to the respective items. The lowest percent of responses (93.5%) was made to prestige item number 10.

TABLE VII  
A COMPARISON OF PERCENTAGES OF MALES' AND FEMALES'  
RESPONSES TO EACH QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM

	MALES (N = 423)		FEMALES (N = 218)		$\chi^2$	Significance Level
	Technical	Parallel	Technical	Parallel		
WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM . . . .						
1. requires more academic ability?	8.6*	91.4*	7.6*	92.4*	0.07	p > .05
2. gives a better general education?	10.5	89.5	9.3	90.7	0.11	p > .05
3. leads to a better occupation?	42.0	58.0	37.3	62.7	1.08	p > .05
4. leads to more job opportunities?	56.8	43.2	51.4	48.6	1.38	p > .05
5. leads to more job satisfaction?	43.1	56.9	37.7	62.3	1.40	p > .05
6. leads to more job advancement?	26.5	73.5	24.9	75.1	0.11	p > .05
7. would you advise for your son?	29.8	70.2	20.5	79.5	5.52	p < .05
8. would you advise for your daughter?	26.3	73.7	19.0	81.0	3.57	p > .05
9. would you prefer?	24.1	75.9	15.5	84.5	5.52	p < .05
10. better for students in working class?	81.4	18.6	84.1	15.9	0.48	p > .05
11. better for students in middle class?	42.2	57.8	40.6	59.4	0.08	p > .05
12. better for students in wealthy class?	14.3	85.7	9.0	91.0	2.92	p > .05
13. is better for most students?	50.1	49.9	38.6	61.4	6.69	p < .01
14. better for students with limited ability?	90.0	10.0	93.2	6.8	1.35	p > .05
15. do you feel is more important?	36.2	63.8	30.8	69.2	1.48	p > .05
16. do you feel is most prestigious?	7.2	92.8	3.4	96.6	2.71	p > .05
WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM REQUIRES . . . .						
1. more building space per program?	88.9	11.1	82.9	17.1	3.73	p > .05
2. more faculty per 100 students?	87.8	12.2	85.1	14.9	0.67	p > .05
3. more administrative personnel?	46.3	53.7	46.3	53.7	0.01	p > .05
4. more student support services?	46.8	53.2	52.7	47.3	1.66	p > .05
5. community support?	74.6	25.4	77.1	22.9	0.32	p > .05
6. more special qualifications for faculty?	61.3	38.7	60.7	39.3	0.01	p > .05
7. more special qualifications for administrators?	45.3	54.8	36.8	63.2	3.64	p > .05
8. more nonprofessional support staff?	67.7	32.3	66.0	34.0	0.11	p > .05
9. more contacts in the community?	83.4	16.6	83.3	16.7	0.01	p > .05
10. more student recruiting?	68.0	32.0	69.6	30.4	0.10	p > .05
11. more specialized equipment?	94.7	5.3	91.4	8.6	1.97	p > .05
12. more supervised laboratory work?	86.2	13.8	87.1	12.9	0.04	p > .05
13. more teaching materials/supplies?	82.5	17.5	82.4	17.6	0.01	p > .05
14. more library facilities?	9.9	90.1	13.5	86.5	1.41	p > .05
15. more travel by administrators?	51.6	48.4	51.2	48.8	0.01	p > .05
16. more travel by faculty?	56.3	43.7	57.7	42.3	0.06	p > .05
17. more program-related travel by the student?	79.0	21.0	69.7	30.3	5.79	p < .05
18. more money per student?	82.7	17.3	69.3	30.7	13.66	p < .001

\*The total number of respondents for each group is shown in the column headings. Each respondent did not, however, respond to each questionnaire item. The numbers shown in the columns are percentages of the numbers responding to the respective items. The lowest percent of responses (91.7%) was made to prestige item number 10.

TABLE VIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSE PERCENTAGES MADE BY  
FOUR AGE GROUPS TO EACH QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM

WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM . . .	AGE GROUPS								X <sup>2</sup>	significance level
	20-30 (N = 116)		31-40 (N = 298)		41-50 (N = 159)		51-60 (N = 79)			
	tech.	para.	tech.	para.	tech.	para.	tech.	para.		
1. requires more academic ability?	11.3*	88.7*	7.7*	92.3*	5.9*	94.1*	11.5*	88.5*	3.75	p > .05
2. gives a better general education?	18.1	81.9	24.6	75.4	11.5	88.5	11.1	88.9	15.79	p < .01
3. leads to a better occupation?	46.0	54.0	41.5	58.5	35.3	64.7	36.0	64.0	3.93	p > .05
4. leads to more job opportunities?	59.6	40.4	50.2	49.8	55.3	44.7	57.8	42.2	3.75	p > .05
5. leads to more job satisfaction?	44.0	56.0	39.0	61.0	43.6	56.4	40.7	59.3	1.29	p > .05
6. leads to more job advancement?	27.4	72.6	27.3	72.7	26.3	73.7	21.3	78.7	1.35	p > .05
7. would you advise for your son?	32.1	67.9	25.1	74.9	26.4	73.6	27.0	73.0	1.93	p > .05
8. would you advise for your daughter?	26.4	73.6	23.2	76.8	24.8	75.2	22.5	77.5	0.60	p > .05
9. would you prefer?	24.8	75.2	21.6	78.4	22.1	77.9	15.4	84.6	2.77	p > .05
10. is better for students in the working class?	84.1	15.9	83.0	17.0	80.0	20.0	82.1	17.9	0.86	p > .05
11. is better for students in middle class?	42.7	57.3	43.0	57.0	37.1	62.9	39.3	60.7	1.59	p > .05
12. is better for students in wealthy class?	15.5	84.5	12.3	87.7	9.1	90.9	15.1	84.9	2.94	p > .05
13. is better for most students?	48.1	51.9	46.5	53.5	43.9	56.1	43.0	57.0	0.76	p > .05
14. is better for students with limited ability?	92.0	8.0	91.9	8.1	88.6	11.4	90.9	9.1	1.47	p > .05
15. do you feel is more important?	41.1	58.9	29.9	70.1	35.6	64.4	36.1	63.9	4.77	p > .05
16. do you feel is most prestigious?	9.0	91.0	4.6	95.4	6.0	94.0	5.7	94.3	2.80	p > .05
WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM REQUIRES . . .										
1. more building space per program?	86.5	13.5	87.2	12.8	87.6	12.4	86.7	13.3	0.08	p > .05
2. more faculty per 100 students?	86.0	14.0	85.6	14.4	90.3	9.7	89.0	11.0	2.41	p > .05
3. more administrative personnel?	48.7	51.3	48.8	51.2	44.5	55.5	47.2	52.8	0.76	p > .05
4. more student support services?	53.6	46.4	49.0	51.0	50.3	49.7	51.7	48.3	0.75	p > .05
5. community support?	79.1	20.9	73.3	26.7	78.9	21.1	77.3	22.7	2.49	p > .05
6. more special qualifications for faculty?	69.6	30.4	57.9	42.1	62.0	38.0	53.4	46.6	6.70	p > .05
7. more special qualifications for administrators?	46.8	53.2	39.0	61.0	43.5	56.5	43.3	56.7	2.27	p > .05
8. more nonprofessional support staff?	68.1	31.9	68.0	32.0	66.7	33.3	71.6	28.4	0.64	p > .05
9. more contacts in the community?	89.3	10.7	81.2	18.8	84.8	15.2	82.8	17.2	4.06	p > .05
10. more student recruiting?	60.2	39.8	72.6	27.4	75.5	24.5	62.1	37.9	10.80	p < .01
11. more specialized equipment?	96.5	3.5	92.0	8.0	94.2	5.8	92.1	7.9	2.98	p > .05
12. more supervised laboratory work?	88.5	11.5	84.8	15.2	90.3	9.7	83.0	17.0	3.93	p > .05
13. more teaching materials/supplies?	83.0	17.0	81.5	18.5	87.4	12.6	77.3	22.7	4.42	p > .05
14. more library facilities?	12.3	87.7	12.2	87.8	11.0	89.0	7.9	92.1	1.37	p > .05
15. more travel by administrators?	48.6	51.4	41.8	58.2	57.8	42.2	54.0	46.0	2.40	p > .05
16. more travel by faculty?	58.9	41.4	56.0	44.0	60.8	39.2	58.0	42.0	0.97	p > .05
17. more program related travel by the student?	80.2	19.8	73.2	26.8	76.4	23.6	81.8	18.2	3.88	p > .05
18. more money per student?	76.6	23.4	78.0	22.0	77.8	22.2	85.2	14.8	2.69	p > .05

\*The total number of respondents for each group is shown in the column headings. Each respondent did not, however, respond to each questionnaire item. The numbers shown in the columns are percentages of the numbers responding to the respective items. The lowest percent of responses (93.9%) was made to prestige item number 10.

Thus, the results of comparisons made along educational level were almost identical to those found when job positions were considered.

It should be further noted that the age categories were somewhat replicates of the occupational categories. For instance, the older participants were usually administrators, middle-aged groups were more likely to be university parallel faculty members, and the youngest participants were most likely to be technical-occupational faculty members. Because of this duplication of categories, very little information was gained by the additional analysis by age categories.

The comparisons of males' and females' responses was not very informative because most of the administrators were male while the females were either university parallel faculty members or technical-occupational faculty members. Again, the duplication of categories resulted in the loss of information caused by grouping participants into the two gender categories.

The additional analyses were informative and helped to further explain some of the results of the study, but because they were secondary questions in the study and because they only tend to substantiate the results obtained from the primary analyses, the results derived from making the secondary comparisons are presented in summary form and not in the detailed manner associated with Table III.



## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions of three groups of educators toward postsecondary technical-occupational programs. Specifically, the investigator compared the perceptions of junior college administrators, junior college university parallel faculty members, and junior college technical-occupational faculty members toward the prestige, financial support, and quality of postsecondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs.

Data for the study was collected by a three part questionnaire which was mailed to two hundred twenty-six (N=226) administrators, five hundred seventy-six (N=576) parallel faculty members, and two hundred forty-four (N=244) technical-occupational faculty members in thirteen (N=13) Oklahoma junior colleges. The survey questionnaire was designed to collect the three groups' opinions concerning the prestige, financing, and quality of technical-occupational programs, university parallel programs, as well as selected biographical information.

Six hundred seventy-two (N=672) administrators, technical-occupational faculty members, and parallel faculty members responded to the Program Survey Questionnaire.

Summary of Findings Related to  
Question 1

A majority of all three occupational groups (technical-occupational faculty, university parallel faculty, and administrators) indicated that university parallel programs require more academic ability, lead to more job advancement, are more advisable for their daughters, are preferred personally, are better for wealthy class students, and are generally more prestigious than technical-occupational programs.

On the other hand, a majority of all three occupational groups indicated that technical-occupational programs are better for working class students and students of limited ability. On the other eight items the three groups' perceptions were mixed.

Summary of Findings Related to  
Question 2

A majority of all three occupational groups indicated that university parallel programs require more administrative personnel and more library facilities than technical-occupational programs.

On the other hand, a majority of all three occupational groups indicated that technical-occupational programs required more building space, more faculty, more administrative personnel, more student support services, more community

support, more community contacts, more student recruiting, more specialized equipment, more supervised laboratory work, more teaching materials and/or supplies, more administrative travel, more faculty travel, more student travel, and more money per student than university parallel programs.

### Summary of Findings Related to Question 3

There were differences among the three groups' highest-quality and lowest-quality program ratings. A majority of the programs rated as lowest-quality by technical-occupational faculty members were technical-occupational programs. A majority of the programs rated as lowest-quality by university parallel faculty and administrators were university parallel programs.

A majority of the programs rated as highest-quality by technical-occupational and university parallel faculty members were university parallel programs. The ratings of highest-quality programs by administrators were approximately equally divided between university parallel and technical-occupational programs.

### Conclusions

Three research questions were posed in this study. In this section, the data relative to these questions are summarized and conclusions drawn.

The first research question investigated in the study

was:

Question 1: Is there a difference among the administrators', technical-occupational faculty members' and university parallel faculty members' perceptions of the prestige of postsecondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs?

Results of the chi square analysis, presented in Table III, show that statistically significant differences ( $p < .0001$ ) were noted among the three groups' responses on 15 of the 16 prestige questions.

Participants' responses to the prestige items were further analyzed in order to more fully address the question posed. The three occupational groups' program preferences are summarized in Table IX. In Table IX, an "X" appears under the type of program preferred by each occupational group. In those instances where no definite preference was shown a double asterisk (\*\*) appears under both programs.

The results presented in Table IX show that the technical-occupational faculty members gave higher prestige ratings to technical-occupational programs on six items, higher ratings to university parallel programs on seven items, and rated the two programs of equal prestige on three items. The university parallel faculty members gave higher prestige ratings to university parallel programs on all 16 prestige items. The administrators gave higher prestige ratings to university parallel programs on 15 items and the administrators rated the programs of equal prestige on

**TABLE IX**  
 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM PREFERENCES AS REPORTED BY THE THREE  
 OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS ON EACH PRESTIGE QUESTION

Questionnaire Item Number	Program Choices by Group					
	T-O Faculty		U-P Faculty		Administrators	
	Technical Programs	Parallel Programs	Technical Programs	Parallel Programs	Technical Programs	Parallel Programs
WHICH TYPE OF PROGRAM. . .						
1. requires more academic ability?		X		X		X
2. gives a better general education?		X		X		X
3. leads to a better occupation?	X			X		X
4. leads to more job opportunities?	X			X		X
5. leads to more job satisfaction?	X			X		X
6. leads to more job advancement?		X		X		X
7. would you advise for your son?	**			X		X
8. would you advise for your daughter?	**			X		X
9. would you prefer?	**			X		X
10. is better for working class students?		X		X		X
11. is better for middle class students?	X			X		X
12. is better for wealthy class students?		X		X		X
13. is better for most students?	X			X	**	
14. is better for students of limited abil.?		X		X		X
15. do you feel is more important?	X			X		X
16. do you feel is more prestigious?		X		X		X
TOTALS . . .	6	7	0	16	0	15

\*Decisions regarding programs viewed as having higher prestige were based on the majority of respondents selecting the item alternative which favored technical-occupational or university parallel programs. (See Table III for response data)

\*\*The two types of programs were judged to be of equal prestige on items which differed less than five percentage points in the responses. (See Table III)

one item.

It is concluded that all three occupational groups view university parallel programs as having higher prestige than technical-occupational programs.

The second research question investigated in the study was:

Question 2: Is there a difference among the administrators', technical-occupational faculty members' and university parallel faculty members' perceptions of the cost of post-secondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs?

Results of the chi square analysis, presented in Table III, show that statistically significant differences ( $p < .0001$ ) were noted among the three groups' responses on 12 of the 18 finance questions.

Participants' responses to the finance items were further analyzed in order to more fully address the second research question posed. The three occupational groups' program preferences are summarized in Table X. In Table X, an "X" appears under the type of program preferred by each occupational group. In those instances where no definite preference was shown a double asterisk (\*\*) appears under both programs.

The results presented in Table X show that the technical-occupational faculty members gave higher cost ratings to technical-occupational programs on sixteen items, higher cost ratings to university parallel programs on only one item, and rated the two programs equally expensive on

**TABLE X**  
**SUMMARY OF PROGRAM PREFERENCES AS REPORTED BY THE THREE**  
**OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS ON EACH FINANCE QUESTION**

Questionnaire Item Number	Program Choices by Group					
	T-O Faculty		U-P Faculty		Administrators	
	Technical Programs	Parallel Programs	Technical Programs	Parallel Programs	Technical Programs	Parallel Programs
<b>WHICH TYPE OF PROGRAM . . .</b>						
1. more building space per program ?	X		X		X	
2. more faculty per 100 students?	X		X		X	
3. more administrative personnel?		**	X			**
4. more student support services?	X		X			**
5. more community support?	X		X		X	
6. more special faculty qualifications?	X			X	X	
7. more special administration qual. ?	X			X		**
8. more nonprofessional support staff?	X		X		X	
9. more contacts in the community?	X		X		X	
10. more student recruiting?	X		X		X	
11. more specialized equipment?	X		X		X	
12. more supervised laboratory work?	X		X		X	
13. more teaching materials/supplies?	X		X		X	
14. more library facilities?		X		X		X
15. more travel by administrators?	X			**	X	
16. more travel by faculty?	X			**	X	
17. more program related travel by students?	X		X		X	
18. more money per student?	X		X		X	
<b>TOTALS . . .</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>

\*Decisions regarding the type of program as being the more expensive were based on the majority of respondents selecting the item alternative which favored technical-occupational or university parallel programs. (See Table III for response data)

\*\*The two types of programs were judged to be equally expensive on items which showed less than five percentage points between the two groups' responses. (See Table III)

one item. The university parallel faculty members gave higher cost ratings to technical-occupational program on thirteen cost items, higher cost ratings to university parallel programs on three items, and rated the two programs equally expensive on two items. The administrators gave higher cost ratings to technical-occupational programs on 14 items, higher cost ratings to university parallel programs on only one item, and rated the two programs equally expensive on three items.

It is concluded that all three occupational groups view technical-occupational programs as being more expensive than university parallel programs.

The third research question investigated in the study was:

Question 3: Is there a difference among the administrators', technical-occupational faculty members' and university parallel faculty members' perceptions of the quality of post-secondary technical-occupational programs and university parallel programs?

Results of the chi square analyses showed that differences were noted among the three groups' highest-quality program ratings and lowest-quality program ratings. Participants' lowest-quality and highest-quality program ratings are summarized in Tables IV and V. These results show that the technical-occupational faculty members indicated that lowest-quality programs were in the technical-occupational field, while university parallel faculty members and administrators indicated that the lowest-quality programs



were in the university parallel area.

Technical-occupational faculty members felt that technical-occupational programs were of higher quality than university parallel programs most of the time.

University parallel faculty members felt that university parallel programs were of higher quality than technical-occupational programs in most instances. Administrators showed no definite difference in their highest-quality program ratings.

It is concluded that the three occupational groups have different perceptions of the quality of the educational programs.

#### Recommendations

It is recommended that further studies be conducted similar to the present study but with an expanded population of administrators, university parallel faculty members, and technical-occupational faculty members. Administrators and faculty members could be included from Oklahoma's four-year colleges and universities as well as such institutions in other states. Results of such a study would give some indication of the image and acceptance of postsecondary technical-occupational programs on a nation-wide basis.

The results of this study indicated that there was a general lack of understanding or a misunderstanding about the goals of postsecondary technical-occupational programs among university parallel faculty members and administrators.

Perhaps orientation seminars and/or workshops should be conducted for the administration and faculty in colleges and universities where postsecondary technical-occupational programs are being conducted. These seminars could help explain the goals of technical-occupational programs and act as a means of improving the program's image and acceptance.

## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ballard, James Barry. The Role and Function of Public Junior Colleges in Oklahoma as Perceived by Citizens, Students, Faculty, Administrators, and Trustees. Unpublished dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma (1973), 8-73.
- Bruning, James L., and B. L. Kintz. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Co., 1968.
- Burkett, Lowell A. "Vocational Education at the Crossroads." American Vocational Journal, February 1968, 13-15.
- Campbell, D. T., and Julian C. Stanley. "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research." Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.
- Childs, Donald L. Does Vocational Education Need to be "Sold"? AVA Member-Gram Pamphlet, Vol. 1, No. 4, (1970).
- Darby, Ed. "Parental Perceptions of Vocational Education." The Journal of Technology, Vol. 14, No. 2, (April, 1976), 24.
- Divita, Charles Jr. Attitudes Toward Vocational Education in The Secondary School of West Virginia. ED 029994, 1968, 132 & 134.
- Fritze, James Keith. An Assessment of Selected Oklahoma Public Schools Personnels' Opinions of the Public Junior College. University of Tulsa, 1974, 10-11.
- Hoyt, Kenneth B. "The 'Image Gap' in Vo-Ed Counseling - Its Causes and Correction." School Shop, February 1970, 41-43.
- Hyman, Herbert H. Survey Design and Analysis. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1955.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. The Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Massachusetts Vocational Education Research Coordinating Unit. Attitudes of Junior High School Staff Members

- Toward Vocational Education, 1969, 4.
- "New Vo-Ed Stature." Stillwater News-Press, 62nd Year, No. 16, (February, 1971).
- Pass, George. "Salvage, Redirection . . . or Custody?". American Vocational Journal, February 1970, 74-76.
- Punke, Harold H. "The Outlook for Humanizing All Vocational Education." American Vocational Journal, May 1968, 19-32.
- Shilt, Bernard A. "The Changing Image of Vocational-Technical Education." American Vocational Journal, February 1970, 14-16.
- Shultz, Fred Alfred. Selected Aspects of Vocational Image as Perceived by Public Categorized by Occupational Levels. Unpublished dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma (1971).
- The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, "National Vo-Ed Council Urges Sweeping Reforms." School Shop, (February, 1970), 14-18.
- Workman, Glenn O. "Schoolmen are Blamed for an Image Problem in Affluent Communities." American Vocational Journal, September 1970, 8.

PLEASE NOTE:

Appendices contain some pages with small indistinct print. Filmed as received in the best possible way.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGE

Educational Survey  
1976-77

Please fill in all spaces below which most accurately describe your status and complete this questionnaire.

1. Highest Degree Earned (respond by showing year degree earned):
 

a. _____ Doctorate	c. _____ Educ. Specialist	e. _____ Associate
b. _____ Master's	d. _____ Bachelor's	f. _____ Certificate or Other
  
2. Please indicate your primary assignment with the college:
  - a. Teaching area \_\_\_\_\_  
(Please Print Name of Teaching Area)
  
  - b. Administration \_\_\_\_\_
  
3. Sex:     \_\_\_\_\_ Male                                   \_\_\_\_\_ Female
  
4. Age:     20-30\_\_\_\_\_ 31-40\_\_\_\_\_ 41-50 \_\_\_\_\_ 51-60\_\_\_\_\_ Over 61\_\_\_\_\_
  
5. Professional Experience:
 

a. College experience in teaching, research, administration, or a related academic staff position:	Amount Of Experience (No. of Years)
At this institution .....	_____
At other institutions in Oklahoma .....	_____
At other institutions outside Oklahoma ...	_____
b. Elementary or secondary school teaching or administrative experience .....	_____
c. Nonteaching experience in business or industry relative to your area of specialization .....	_____

AFTER COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE,  
PLEASE RETURN TO YOUR DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON.

A Questionnaire by Robert V. Keck



DIRECTIONS: Please indicate your opinion comparing the advantages and requirements of postsecondary technical-occupational programs and the university parallel programs by placing a X check mark in each space under the appropriate column.

## SECTION I PRESTIGE

WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM . . .	Technical Occupational Programs	University Parallel Programs
1. requires more academic ability?	( )	( )
2. gives a better general education?	( )	( )
3. leads to a better occupation?	( )	( )
4. leads to more job opportunities?	( )	( )
5. leads to more job satisfaction?	( )	( )
6. leads to more job advancement?	( )	( )
7. would you advise for your son?	( )	( )
8. would you advise for your daughter?	( )	( )
9. would you prefer?	( )	( )
10. is better for students in the working class?	( )	( )
11. is better for students in middle class?	( )	( )
12. is better for students in wealthy class?	( )	( )
13. is better for most students?	( )	( )
14. is better for students with limited ability?	( )	( )
15. do you feel is more important?	( )	( )
16. do you feel is most prestigious?	( )	( )

## SECTION II FINANCE

WHICH TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAM REQUIRES . . .	Technical Occupational Programs	University Parallel Programs
1. more building space? per program?	( )	( )
2. more faculty per 100 students?	( )	( )
3. more administrative personnel?	( )	( )
4. more student support services?	( )	( )
5. community support?	( )	( )
6. more special qualifications for faculty?	( )	( )
7. more special qualifications for administrators?	( )	( )
8. more nonprofessional support staff?	( )	( )
9. more contacts in the community?	( )	( )
10. more student recruiting?	( )	( )
11. more specialized equipment?	( )	( )
12. more supervised laboratory work?	( )	( )
13. more teaching materials/supplies?	( )	( )
14. more library facilities?	( )	( )
15. more travel by administrators?	( )	( )
16. more travel by faculty?	( )	( )
17. more program-related travel by the student?	( )	( )
18. more money per student?	( )	( )

## SECTION III QUALITY

**DIRECTIONS:** The list of programs shown below comprises the approved and accredited programs offered by your institution. Read the list carefully. Based upon your personal opinion:

1. Place an (H) by the three (3) highest quality programs offered by your institution.
2. Place an (L) by the three (3) lowest quality programs offered by your institution.

## PROGRAMS

<input type="checkbox"/> Accounting	<input type="checkbox"/> Physical Education
<input type="checkbox"/> Agri-Business	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-Professional
<input type="checkbox"/> Airport Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Psychology
<input type="checkbox"/> Art	<input type="checkbox"/> Secretarial Administration
<input type="checkbox"/> Aviation	<input type="checkbox"/> Social Studies
<input type="checkbox"/> Biology	<input type="checkbox"/> Speech & Drama
<input type="checkbox"/> Business Administration	<input type="checkbox"/> Fire Fighting Technology
<input type="checkbox"/> Business Economics	<input type="checkbox"/> Child Care Administration
<input type="checkbox"/> Business Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Technology
<input type="checkbox"/> Commercial Art	
<input type="checkbox"/> Cooperative Business	
<input type="checkbox"/> Corrections	
<input type="checkbox"/> Drafting & Design	
<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary Education	
<input type="checkbox"/> English	
<input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Language	
<input type="checkbox"/> General Physical Sciences	
<input type="checkbox"/> General Science	
<input type="checkbox"/> General Studies	
<input type="checkbox"/> Humanities	
<input type="checkbox"/> Journalism	
<input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement	
<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics	
<input type="checkbox"/> Medical Secretary	
<input type="checkbox"/> Mid-Management	
<input type="checkbox"/> Music	

Review your responses in Sections I, II, and III. If you would like to make comments relative to your responses, please do so in this space.

---

SECTION I RESPONSES

SECTION II RESPONSES

SECTION III RESPONSES

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER SENT WITH DATA  
COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

500 Education Building  
State Capitol Complex  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Enclosed is a brief questionnaire which is being used to collect data for a study. It has been designed to obtain the opinions of all full-time technical-occupational faculty, all full-time university parallel faculty, and all full-time administrators at each college.

The intent of the items in this survey is to obtain your point of view or opinion as to the prestige, finance, and quality of all education programs on your campus.

Please do not place your name on this document. The information requested will be published only in the form of statistical summaries.

Your cooperation in this survey is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Robert V. Keck  
Technical Education  
Officer

RVK/p

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

CARD FORMAT AND 80-80 LISTING  
OF IBM CARDS

Information	Card Column(s)	Range of values
1. Type of position	1	1-3
2. Highest degree earned	2	1-6
3. Type of position	3	1-3
4. Gender	4	1-2
5. Age	5	1-4
6. Years of experience at this institution	6-7	01-27
7. Years of experience at other institutions	8-9	01-25
8. Years of experience at other institutions out of state	10-11	01-25
9. Years of teaching experience	12-13	01-30
10. Years of non-teaching experience	14-15	01-40
11. Institution	16-17	01-13
12. (Blank)	18-20	---
13. Responses to 16 prestige questions	21-36	1-2
14. Responses to 18 finance questions	37-54	1-2
15. Three highest quality programs	55-60	01-65
16. Three lowest quality programs	61-66	01-65
17. (Blank)	67-80	---

Figure 1: Card format used to enter coded data.

121120303	050506	1111111111112121121111211111111111081023131718
1211206	1006	22222222222211211111121111221111042328131826
1212204	0305 06	222222222222122111112221111121111082330162124
1412204	02 0506	22222222222211211111111211122111082330161821
1412302	1506	2222222222 2 111211111111111112211123
1212310	030206	121111111112111112211211111121121082223131824
121120602	0606	121111111112111112211121111112211081021131734
1411103	0206	121111111112111112211221111112111081021131734
121120604	0506	221111111112111211221112211122111080923131417
1411106	02 0806	22111111111112212211121211122112081011131731
121220503	06	2211111111121112222212211222222222222834033738
1211208	06	221111111112111222222222122222222142021040531
1211310	02 06	2211111111121112211211122111122221091020031833
121131510	06	221111111112111211211122111122222081020323738
1211208	06	2211111111111112111211111222222082021163137
2412206	06	222222222211221222222222222222222131524010236
2412206	02 06	221111111112111211211121111112222111934032326
2412210	04 06	221121222112112211221122111112222031637040511
2222311	130206	2211111111112211211221111122222121523141836
2221414	070706	2212222221111121122111211112111101123131737
2221212	04 06	2221212222212211221112211121112111012330183437
2121102	06	22212222212211121111111211122211132330031624
2221202	08 06	22222222212221222122212221122111010523172434
22214	121806	2222222222211221121121111111111091930071834
22217	06	221121222112212211221121211121111091623183137
2221208	06	111111111111111122112111111121111010630162334
2221209	09 06	222122222122212211222121111122211062530173638
221142401	01 06	222111212 222122111111111112111011119353738
21224031003	06	1211211122222221122112212111222111123 162437
31113100709	06	1221222121122211211211211122111012330171834
3211309	110306	2211111111111111211111111111111010823293437
3211202	11 0106	222222222112111221112111211121121011923293537
323130503	080406	22222222212221221111221111121111041530143438
3222305	04 0406	22112122211221221121122211112222232530031837
31231004	06	22111111111211122221222112222222091020323738
3222206	02 06	222222222112212211222122212222222031331010236
3221310	06	222222222112212211222122211222222252735081217
3431203	06	22111111111111122222122211112222172038030711
1211205	0701	221212211122122211121122111122111061030030814
1212101	01	2211122221222122112211211111122111091033172136
1211202	030301	222121 112211221122211111121111030916081014
2221101	06 01	111112222122212112121121211122211050934151728
2421211	12 01	222122222222122122222111122211041220630814
24212010305010101	01	21111222112111211111122211222 031220080914
22221010401	01	222222221222122112222211112221 061223030814
2221308	120601	222222222222221121112111122211051220030822
2221205	04 01	22222222222212221122222222221222040512030836
2121211	02 01	121222222122212222211111122211011012262936
2221207	07 01	2222222222221221112111111121111042025030814
2221211	05 01	222222221221221111111211122211042528030814
242231708	01	222222221221221122222121122222041235162936
222120601	13 01	2222222212212211221221111121111232534031636
353120215	150101	2211222221221122112211211122211021035030816



323118701	01	2211221111121122111211112111211110	10535062636
3232193	01	222122222 2221221111122112111211111041	1230011532
3232206	120301	111112222111121111111111111111111921	30030814
3231404	150301	1112111221121112112111222111222110	50835262829
3231311	16 01	2221222222222122112211111111222111	22024030814
11113020506050603		22111122212111211121111111111111111111	2635212942
121110402 02 03		2222222222222122111111111111112111104	0506162838
1211103 06 03		2222222221221122111112111111211110	12742101112
1211103 1003		221111222221221122111111111111111111	
1211101 06 03		22111122211211221111111111111111111111	1111101112163739
1211102 0403		22221112111111211111221111111111111110	1111101112163338
1211202 03080103		221222222122112211211111111111111122	1010516122042
1212402007 0103		11112112112111221111221111112111110	63041021215
1411201 05 1303		1111111111211111111111111111111111111	111081011022338
1411205 0503		22	
1412204 03		22222222211221221122222211122222041	737021621
1211102 052403		1111111111111111111111111111111111111	11011933020813
21 31204 03		21111111111111112112111221111122222011	1033022021
211201030703 03		222222222222211111111111111111111111	221032734384142
22110302 04 03		222222222222222111111111111111111111	32026163538
221104 02 03		222122222222122111122211111111111111	31421070818
2212205 04 03		222222222122212211111221111111111111	31426283238
221105 02 03		221111222122212211111121111111211111	
2212310 08 03		222111222122212211111111111111111111	1021320070818
221208 04 03		221111122122212211111111111111111111	11032731283338
221205 05 03		2222222222222221122212222111222210	40917384243
221102 03 03		2222 2 2 122 222 2222112222	041734213841
21 1308 0404 03		2121222122112211221121112221106163021	3843
2211210 08 03		222122222 1221122112211122211111	31626283238
2211323 0103		2221222221222122112211211211111111	31726212833
22121 01 0203		21212222212211122121111111112221210	1619283941
222103 03		222222 21222122222222222211111220	70822384041
2221210 0503		222 12 212211121111111111211110	11334283238
2221316020102 03		11111222112111111121121121112111051	341031120
222106 03		221112222221111211211121121122211	12081339152021
2221103 0202 03		222122222122212211222112111112211	1081734213243
222120902 03		2221212221111221112122111112111131	426333543
2221325 03		22 11111221211121111041924283842	
222131002 03		22111222 1122122112111 111112222110	40506022742
313151207 19 03		2222222221222122111112222111221111	
3131308 02100303		222222222222122111211121111121111	1202734283758
3232303 260303		22222222212211221111111121112111	2081016192843
3331311100210 03		2212221211122122112211211122221081	619152137
3131405 071603		22111111111211121111111111211111	163243092542
3231103 06 03		22222222212221222222222222222222	22162234023843
323120602 03		22222222 112212222222222212222222	2214041010233
323230304 02 03		221111111121112212 112112111222121	31740102833
1411104 0308		22112222211111211111111111211112	32946222530
1211421 03030508		1221122221 2 12211211111111211111	254044105558
1211423 1208		122212222122112211221121111122111	152944202158
1411201 06 0108		22111222212211121111111121111011	1146
121120403 100208		1112111111211121122111111111 2110	74546222343
121241202 140508		2 12222212221121111221111221111	394546172223
12113050106 1008		22111216211211121122111211122211	1074649262728
1211209 030208		211212112111221121111111211110	74856143058

1311425	010438	2211222221122122111112211112221111287942625255
12123	0908	2222222221222222
141229103	010408	22212222211112121131112111111121111131940175051
121123701	0208	211 11111 11 11 11 111112 11334058030400
12123312	01020708	2222222222222211111111111111111111074546
1211208	0608	221111111112111211111121111112121274243053848
121120602	08	221111111112111222222222122222222424359020304
121220604	08	222222221122122222222222122222222103940050625
121231002	08	22222222112212222222222212222222208464935960
121220604	08	22222222112212212212222222111122222070846020304
1412205 02	08	2221111111121112112221222111122222081719054349
2222210	08	2222222222212212222221222222222
222120701	080108	22212222122212 1121122111112221110745
222151701	22 08	221112222112 1 2222111111111221111041134101519
222130803	03 08	2211111212211212222121111112221060747173359
2421407	011808	22111212211221 221221 2 1122222112072347
222108040	030108	21 1 21 1 2112 1 1 1 2 111
22213040401	2308	22222222222122111221111111212111010647
22214080214	0408	22122 122 21122112211221112221041240225055
212 0011004	308	22122222222212 11221 211211122111173047152457
222 014	08	221111122122212221221 211111122211062945243848
222130406014	08	21111122211111111221 11121111111222356020435
242230604	08	22111111112111211222122211112222052426565960
222220802	08	221111222111212211211221111122222092441033352
222121004	08	221111111111111112111221111122222295051052238
2221101	08	222221222112212212222212111122111083453020304
222231202	08 08	2221122221122122112111222111122222173148020304
313131210	05 08	22211221211211121122112111121211293946174054
3131431	08	2221122221221122112212211112222211073745041022
3331308	18 08	222 2222212221221111111111111111194856202129
323220101	080108	221111222211211211111111111112111194053153557
3131316	01 08	2 2 2 2 211 1 111111 11091840141738
323120801	08	22222222222122211212121111112 313940185458
1211206	0213	121111121112111212111111111111111192447212757
1611103	13	211122121111121121221111121122222
1211207	1113	22211211111211 211 1111111111 111182450212570
121126703	0413	211111 11111111221111111122111
1611303	2013	22111111111211121112111111111121121
1412303	1013	2221122221221122112111211112222111011450202770
1412302	0613	222212222 1222221 221122221112194950212931
1412304	02031113	211112 1 11 11 111 1211 1 1315066
14123040106	1113	222212222121212211211121111121112081950
1411103	0413	221112 2111112111211122121 122112505758212829
121210203	0213	12111122212211221222111111111 1 1394049010444
1611203	0713	121111111121111111111111111111111013158
121 203	1013	1221111111121112111111111111111111314950151721
121 204	1313	22222222122122111112111111211111505758366067
1411202	1913	221112 111112211221211211122211031950
1412205 02	0813	121112222112121211211112111112111233050051327
1412103	0213	211112222 2221221111111111111121112053150304143
1412504	062513	222222221221122 1 11111111211111950
1211102 05	13	22111211112211221111212122211192650010770
1212107	0613	211111111121112111111111111111111011933212529
121120703030113	22	211111111121111111111111111111111031950222529
1211206	0513	2 2 2 2 21111211121111119355017227

1511302	06	2813	2111111111	111111	1	1	11	1	11	1921342955
1212107		0213	1211111111	111111	111111	111111	111111	111111	111111	193350172767
1412302		120913	2111111111	121111	2221111111	121111	111111	111111	111111	1195066476167
1411203		0713	2112111111	1221121	121	12	111112	111111	111111	1195053206271
1411204		13	2111111111	1211121	122212221111	222222	2265372070814			
1212206		0313	2211111111	1211221	122212221111	222222	2303150636870			
2122307		0713	22222222	1221221	1222222	1112111211				
2221102		06	22222222	12211221	111212221111	121111				
2222207		01	222		21112112111111	1211110	11949214344			
222220603		13	2221222222	1221221	11	11	1112	?	1	
2222203		020113	2211212221	12211221	1211121111	22212221	93350052746			
2422104		13	22222222	12212221	122122111111	22122062	450252737			
2222207		040113	2221222222	12211111	1121121111	2110711	150203444			
2221106		0201	22222222	1221221	122122111111	22212021	114192131			
2222405		13	2221	222	11		11319176061			
2221206		0113	22222222	12211221	1111111111	21121081	1214212737			
2121206		02	221111122	22112211	2112211111	21211011	1214162136			
2221106		13	22222222	12211221	121112211111	2221107081	4435364			
2221206		13	22112111	22221221	122122112111	2221107081	19101553			
2221206		020113	22112222	112211221	1221111121	2221201101	12252772			
2221208		13	221121222	212	112221111211	21111011	450366267			
2222207		13	222122222	1	1111211	211121110	10750151721			
222220601		0413	22222222	12211221	122111112111	211101021	2444547			
212120704		04	22122222	112111	211122111111	211101485	8052155			
2221206		11	22222222	12111221	1222212221	1121110104071	74853			
2221207		050113	221111221	11211121	122111112111	21110311	150224860			
2221104		13	22222222	2221221	111122111111	211107101	3222324			
222106		13	22222222	12211111	122111112111	211108101	4171819			
2221204		060513	22222222	1221221	111122111111	211101021	12212753			
2221102		03	22222222	1221221	111122111111	211101061	2152029			
2222103		04	22222222	1221221	111122111111	21111				
2222206		08	22222222	12211221	111112211111	211107081	10156061			
2221104		13	22222222	1221221	111122111111	211108101	1151653			
2221102		050113	22112222	1221221	11111111	11121111	194050424448			
2222204		05	22112222	1221122	1	111	11			
2221307		10	22212222	12211	111111111111	2111010250				
2122205		13	2221112221	1221221	122212221111	22222031	761070849			
2221310		04	22111111	1121112222	122111112222061	2222061	223297071			
3231307		1113	22211211	11111121	12221222	1112222101	1150253764			
3232203		0713	22222222	112221221	1111111111	2111				
3231303		040113	2							
3231207		07	22112222	211211121	1122112111	2111195364	132254			
3131408		2503	12111111	11111121	1221112111	1122211				
3231020101		13	2							
3432307		1113								
3231106		0213	11111111	1111121	1111111111	1111193848	142568			
3131207		0702	2		112111	1	111111			
3231307		10	11212111	121111	1	1111121111	10119501	32860		
3231207		050813	2211121111	12112121	122111212221	14750642	52955			
3231207		070113	212	2	2	1	211	211	1111112	111195064101336
3232205		040113	22	2121221	2121221	122	1111	111221	10721344	86164
3231207		03	22222222	1222221	122112211111	22211195058091	140			
32324070105010513		13	22212222	11211221	122111112221	10107500	50613			
343140401		101513	22111111	1111221	1111211111	1111031980	366278			
3231407		10101013	1112	222222	12211211					

3031307		2213	2 1	111111 111111 21111
3031306		1213	2211121211111 121111111 1121111 211111 195066305364	
3232403	0505	13	222222222122212211111111111122211125064192125	
3031207	11	13	221112122111111112112211111111211111122464275455	
313120502		13	22222222211221222222222222222222222394042102125	
313130502		13	22111112211211221122111122211122222121819071053	
3232203		0813	2211112221121122112221221111122222394045536370	
121120201		0605	21111222212111211222221111122222041523033036	
121130109	06	0305	22212222212121 21112222211112222152227031820	
1211401		1005	222222222 222 22122222212211222212072438091834	
141130101		2205	222222222222222122 211111121111041126121820	
222220208	01	05	22111112112212212222121221122212092328121339	
2221402	01	2805	222121 2 21 21211 211 1112121 080923131633	
222240804	110605		2221222221122122112222211211122212040833121827	
222120106	040105		222222222 212211221222221222221081127020613	
242240112	12	05	2221222221121122112222212111 22211010304020512	
22214141502	17	05	221212221121122112222212111 22211010204030612	
2221206	07	05	221222221 2212222212112212 22211040721123336	
222110101		05	221222221 221222222122212121 2222040733121517	
222201	01	05	222222222 22122222111111111111111081115141827	
212110201		05	2221 2 2 1 211221 1111102121111534072535	
2222406	06	05	2221212221221222122112112122 22211050828142139	
2221413	12	05	221222221111211111111111211122111081623182239	
222121306	06	05	22222222212212221222222221222221041127141830	
222120104		0505	2211222221 211221122112211222222	
2121509		05	2222222221 221222222222222222222222081927142034	
2222306	01	0605	2222222221 21112122222111222222	
222231009	09	0805	22212222212212222112222172222172628141830	
2221204	08	05	221121 2122 1 1122 22212 2222212051723132021	
212230606	09	05	2222222221222122111122212111 22111112123071828	
222120102		05	222122222122122222112111111 2221080911071416	
313120207	06	05	22222222212211221111121111111111112934101836	
313220107	05	05	222122222122212221221121221122222152122131418	
323120304	06	05	22222222212211221122122212111 22211072628131830	
3131210	07	05	22221222212211221122111111111111152838061320	
3431106		05	222112 11211121122211212112 2222040823133034	
3231310	03	05	222222222122122222222222222222222041523091220	
313130705	110405		2221222221221121121111111121111050911021318	
1412201	09	02	2211111211111121122112111111 222121020313152838	
1412103	0502		221111111112 112212211121111122222020313153642	
1211103		02	21211111111121112112112211111122111010818343839	
2221205	02020202		222222222222122111212121212122221081830063442	
2221206	07	1102	2211112112112111211122212211121211082129153941	
2221423	04	02	22211222212211 2112222211111121111032730151638	
2221208	08	02	2221122222211221122111 1111122111050829010725	
2221401	081802		2211222221121121112111122111112211081839071525	
2221305	0409	02	222222222222122111122211211121211010527152538	
2222101		0302	2222122221121122111211121 21122111091939041525	
222105	0700	02	222112 2122111211221111111122111050829010725	
2222305	01	0602	2222222222222211212222222222222212435153742	
2221209	03	02	2211222221122122211222112221122212060818040711	
2422202	05	02	221122 11221121122122122112112111112132152634	
2221204040107	08		2222222221221 21111111111121112111211081820073841	
2222102	0302	02	2222 22222 1 2 12 21 211 22 1 081821263442	

2221102	05	02	22112222212211221111111111111122211061832102534
242110101		02	22222222222222122121211111212321222011829072734
222210102	06	02	2211211121121122112211221211122221081829172634
222131110	1004	02	22212222122112222222212212222212030829253840
2421102		02	1211121211112211112221212211122211021220072540
2521103		0202	211111111121112112121111211122211021827092541
2221205	03	102	221111122122212211122212111121221052429163638
2221107		0102	221112221121112212211211112121111081831063439
2221201060504		02	212222222121112112122111212121222012139062634
2221303		120402	21122222 1221122122221111212122221222324153341
2421101	02	02	222222222122212222221222112222222081830061734
2221207		07 02	222221122122112221121111111122111081826384041
3121305	060502	02	21212222211111211111112111122221030818152540
3221010202		0102	22121222222 1122 1 1 211 22 1030824151629
34221		02	2111122121121112212111211212222212050829182842
3622301		2002	2111221111121112211211121112222212030913071525
322102	03	02	121122222112111211121111211121111030817041534
3222403	051703	02	222112222122211211111111111121111030829071541
3221405		011502	2221122221122122111212211211121111020329071525
322104		04 02	22211222212 1122112211221111121111030818010207
352213		02	22122222 12221122112211212122212012222254041
32210201	060102		2211 2 1 211 111111112111081830093439
3221105	03	02	22 21222222221 2212221121212122212030818062541
3222213		02	22121222212211222222222222222222081424091538
3221302		050402	21111111112111211111112111121111010203071540
3221102		0102	2211221121221122111222212211122212070821153839
32221		02	2221222221222122222222212111122222040814022940
1211404		171207	2111121111111111221122121112222111214081842
1411309		08 07	221111111222122112211211221122212021538235154
1311210		0207	221 22211221222111211111211121 11111938062842
1211209		0307	2211111111112121112211 111122211051120040842
1211104		0407	2211111112211221111121111112 111134144042742
1212212		060307	2211222222212211221111122211111111013043
1211315		0407	22222222122111211221111211122111013741183245
1211104		0607	2221222221121112111211111121111113238273350
1211310		110607	212111 1 2211 1112111 121111
12125070504		0907	11111111121112111221111122111122036022334
1412102		0107	12111 11211121122111112211110353823
1411301		1807	212112221 111211111111111121111021719222740
11114150101		1507	21111211111121 11111111111121111141938062754
1411103		010207	121111111121112111111111111111111111419
1212306		04 07	222222222 111211111111111121111101438040841
1211103		021007	211111112111121221111211112221102325081431
1211530		1007	2211121111121112211221111122211051431184253
1212310		1007	2111111111211121111111111112111101438081644
2221202	03	07	221112222222212211221112121112111022135062345
222110301	01	07	211122122221121111212211212221222022028040654
2222209	0106	07	22212222112112222222222222 22 2 022538515354
24 1408		05 07	222212222222212221221212121112021535042728
22 120104		0307	22222222222222112222212211122211022247082128
2221531		05 07	2222222221 2212221222112211121112021535042428
2221202		03 07	222222222222122112212211211222222353847242846
2222208		1607	2221222212221221222221111122222021535184850
222241215	190207		222122212221221111221222222222073435023859
22214270202		07	222122212221221111221222222222073449242836

2222301	06	07	22	2222222222	1222	2222222222	2222	2222222222	21	5204	3050612
222121201	04	07	222	122	2211221	21111111111111	1111111111	1111111111	11	3340	62936
2222507	35	07	222	2222221222	1221111122112111	1121112111	1121115213	8061727			
2221102	0307		222	2222222222	1221222222211222	2211222	2211201084	3062332			
2221310	13	07	222	112222122	12211111111111	1111111111	1111091520	2121630			
222241002	10	07	222	2222222222	12211111221111111111	1111111111	1111131617	274852			
2222213	03	07	222	2222222222	12211111221111112111	1111111111	111117214	7235154			
2221208	07		222	1222221121112221	21221121111222	2139444	5102038				
2221209	01	0307	222	2222222222	2121222222	211222	2022041293	445			
2221208	050307		222	222	1211211221121111211111	1111221111	108384	3274751			
2221212	0307		211	12122211211121112222	11212121111	102051	1232039				
2221423	0903	07	222	2222221222	1222222222	122	2232	2202153504	2428		
2121320	04	07	222	2222222222	22112221122111111111	11111110	2113527	3942			
222241620	20	07	222	1211121121112111111111	11111222	22104153	5444851				
2222310	05050507		221	112222112212211111221	1111121111	2111101031	5273449				
2211030101	07		222	2222222222	122112112112111	212111	2111091120	32439			
221102	02	07	221	112211122111211122	122121211111	113414	5425154				
2211422	07		111	22211122211121111111	1122121212	211134	144052354				
2212210	06	0507	222	1222222222	11221111112212	2121212	222113285	1102631			
221152907	040207		222	1222221222	1221111111211111	2111101020	4030612				
2211209	05	07	222	2222221222	122112111211121111	2221113213	7010828				
22224120306071007			2222	2222	1	091721					
2221416	17	07	222	1222222222	122121222112121	2111102154	7363738				
2221207	0307	07	222	22222	12221221222	22122222	2221202152	2283940			
2221101	07		212	22222211221121112111	211111222	202155	2133941				
2221430	0507		222	2222222222	2211211111121111	2222102254	9040844				
2121408	20	07	222	1121221111112111112111	22222111384	7062731					
2121317	1007		121	111111111111112211111111	2111111111	119384	25154				
2222410	1707		122	112222112222	111111112111111111	110384	7414244				
2221206	050207		221	21212111111121122111111111	2211110111	5042754					
2221205	1307		221	112222112112211221111112	11211222	1120343806	4245				
2222522	08	07	221	2222221222	1221122211111122	2211520340	64245				
222120904	07		222	1222221221	1221112111112111	211110511380	62939				
2221206	0707		111	11111221112121122112212122	2121111520380	55054					
2222306	0107		212	2222222222	1221111111111111	111021520	122627				
22214080314	1107		121	11111111111111112111212111	2221105101	5042754					
222140820	20	07	222	22222212221	2212212211221222	22120707200	65354				
222120803	020407		221	11222212211221122111211111	221111532382	74453					
2221307	0611	07	212	122222112112211221111111	1221111203724	2844					
222121204	07		221	11111112111211221112121111	211102111	4062753					
2221413	140307		221	1222222222	122122112211212111	221110214200	40627				
2222211	020107		222	222222212221	1111221111111111	11091521082	543				
2221304	060907		222	222222212221	1111221111112211	11082138033	252				
1212102	0909		221	11211111111122211112112111	2212106252	62343					
1212207	04	09	211	1122221121112111111111	211111013402	43045					
1212306	01070209		222	222222212221	1221111111111111	2111106072909	3052				
1412206	1209		111	111121121121122111211111	1111102840204	149					
1411504	2509		222	212122122211222111211111	222220107095	15354					
1212106	0209		111	121111112111211121121111	221110613502	13045					
131120703	0409		212	2121111111211111111111	2111108283805	2249					
1212205	050209		212	222222212221	222221221111222220	7295004	3339				
121240303	230209		222	222222212221	12222211111222	107105004	2449				
1212204	060209		222	22222212221	1221122111112221	1108102514	3048				
121230303	100409		222	222222112122112212212111	22222						
1212203	07	09	221	112222112112211121112111	1112222						

1212104	010209	21221222212221	211122111111	2111101140465253
12112070401	0409	121111111111	112211	111111111102840052249
1411103	09	22112	2 2 112112221121211	122111252840092130
1411105	0309	221111111111	211221121112212111	12221102840044648
121120301	090309	22222222212221221	122111111111	122212010610414952
121110702	0409	22211222212221221	111111111111	111111151623041730
1211204	0409	22222222212221221	111111111111	121111060709151620
1212202020405	09	22111111212221221	111111111111	1111131439151620
121120502	0609	12111122212211221	111122211111	121111
212130601	08 09	2212222222222222	222222222222	222222
222102	04 09	22222222212221221	111111111111	121111101340142446
222301	13 09	2212	2222222222111211221211	122211011017142125
222120406	09	22211222212221221	11112211211	122221173054103237
212 410040510	09	22222222212221221	11112211211	121111061017014151
1213050508070309		22112222212211221	111111111111	111111404254122430
2221304	150509	22211222212221222	1211211	1222121071047333950
222220301	06 09	22222222212221221	1122111211	1121212041224
2222305	06 09	22222222212221221	1222221221	1122221061022112132
2221205	04 09	22212211211221221	1221222111	12221101228031422
2221306	14 09	22222222212221221	1121112111	122211052834
222130702	060309	2222222222211221	1221111111	122211273436032653
212120501	02 09	2	2 2 11	2 104254
222120404	0209	2	2 2 1111	11104754192036
22225072704380309		2121121111	1112111211221111	122211101636434445
2421203	01010309	22	2 1	2 104754
21213030109	0109	222212222221221	1111112211121	1211051028
2222303	13 09	2221122221	221 211221112111	122221012740435051
212240413	13 09	2211222222221221	11221112211	122221173947034553
2222206	02 09	2222222211221221	2221221121222	222173947505153
21214030603	0309	2222	22221221111221111	121111172736304243
2222407080105	09	22211222212211	222222121121	1122222041721031441
2121202	04 09	22	222 2212221	1 22 221041012
212230401	0209	22	222 122	11112 1
2221204	08 09	22222222212221221	11112212111	12111122130151620
2221305	070309	22222222212222221	1111221111	121111010607151626
222120402	05 09	2222222222222221	1111221111	121111041730080913
222 203	0206 09	22222222212221221	1111221111	121111334254172148
22223030204	09	2211111121111	1221222222111	12222060709232936
2121101	09	2222222222222221	1111221111	12111101230080952
2222204	05 09	22222222212211221	11111221111	12111394647132052
222120203	09			394749021822
2322204	07 09	22211222211221221	1112221111	121111121748151623
222220402	04 09	22222222212221221	1111221111	121111121730181920
2221204	09	22211222211221221	1111221111	122212353740020326
2221205	08 09	22222222212221221	1111221111	121111333437434445
222 206	08 09	22222222212221221	1111111111	121111394748094351
2221304060210	09	22222222212221121	1211221111	121111262734151620
2221205	02 09	22212222212211222	222222121121	1222221011043032430
31314050502120309		12121211211211	211222112221	1222211072836143348
323130703	100209	22222222212221221	1111221111	121111121111
313140702	17 09	222222212222221221	1111221111	122211102547143033
3231304	100309	211111111111	12211222221111	122211103654243053
31313060106	0309	21211222212211221	1111111111	11061636095152
3231202	19 09	222122222221221	1221122111	122211101316144849
31312030301	0309	2211122221222	221121112111	12211102636092249

3131205040	020109	22222222222212211221222111122211651634144649
3131306	16 09	222221222122212211111111111121111103447143033
323120303	12 09	1212122121121112122111121111122221101939303348
3231107	0209	22212222211222221111 12111111121111081013091520
323130701	120109	2211122221221122111211221111121111101636131519
313130602	14 09	222222222222122112212211111121111
343130703	070409	222 222222222122212212211111122211012934152023
313120502	070109	222222222222122112221212211122211172840010749
36323	1309	222112222222122112211121111122212171328043033
313230403	140109	22211222222122122212221111122211141946123048
323120408	0309	211 11 2111111111111121111
323120507	09	22222222222222111222111221211111102847020330
3232204	17 09	22222222211211221111111111121111061016033346
3231205 09	09	2222222221122122111112211111121111394147265254
323 20402	0509	222222222222122111112211111121111
323 30605	10 09	222222222222122111112211111121111353637414346
3131204020506	09	22222222212221221111122111112111121724202326
3131203	09	221122221122122112111111122221353738031623
1411302	05 1511	222122111112111211 111 1111112 1 1091020263738
1411305	070611	21111111112111111221122111112221091018061528
1211403	090611	22222222222212211112221222222221080936032233
1611402	3311	2222222221222122112121112111122211080910282933
1511204	011011	2211111111121112111211111211122211080917111628
1412205	1211	12111211111212111111111112111111101718
1412204	0411	221111222112211121111111111121111011018
1411102	010611	221112112212111121112111211212122211121328072126
121 202	04 0611	121111111111111211111111111121111080936223237
1211101	04 0311	121111111111111211111111111121111080917011229
1212101	05 11	221111111211111211111111111121111042434053236
1211103	11	2222222222222222111112111111211111061617222436
1212202	080511	22222222212211121112212211111121111041438010205
1212201	0911	12111111111111121111111111111111101718121636
1212103	0611	222212222122111211111111111121111041424050612
1212203	11	221111111112111212 2212211111222 1101727253637
1211203	04 11	221111111112111222 11122211112222143335010522
1212102	0411	221111111112111211 111111111122221020437162829
1211203	0411	221111111112112211 11121111 1122222031525012236
1211204	11	221111111111111211 111221111122222080936151628
1212304	02 11	2211111111121112111211111122222101727063638
1211203	070411	2222222222221221111211111121111041438121926
1212203	11	2211111111121112222222212222222101827012229
2221205	11	22212222212221221122222212222222132023111517
2221205	07 11	22222222122212211222221111121111020423152126
22222 02 07 11		132023171837
2221205	1011	2222222221211121112121211112 11202123051736
21212050001	11	2222112221221122111212211 112222110210131522 1
2221204	09 11	2212222221222122111111111121112011014052231
2221205	0411	2222222212222212221222121122211202326080918
22 20304	11	22222222222222111111111111111111721243236
22 10204	11	2222222212221221111111111121111212526010532
2121201	0202 11	2211112221222122111122211211222211101119212326
221401	4011	22222222222212211211111111121111061617323637
221101	01 11	22122122212221122111222111211222222121723323537
222205	0102 11	22222222222222222212222222222221218200103 1
2221205	04 0311	221122221121111111112111122111051317313638



2221202		0511	2222222212221221122221221222221010220283137
2221201	0701	11	221112111111112212122211211112222011017152937
222210107	030311		2122 2 212211 011017343637
222130201	0911		22 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 2 011835071529
2221201		0511	222212222122212211222111211122111041017152432
2121201	04	11	22 1 2222122 122 1 2111 111 221110111119
212210305		11	2212221211222122112211221211121212011017071532
2221104		11	22222222211221222222222212222222041330012132
222220402		11	22222222112212222222222211122222122528012232
222120303		11	221111111121112111211111122112080920012829
222220408		11	222222222122212211211221111121111122125053637
2222202	09	11	22222222212221221111221111122111212632053436
222 3040	02	11	2222222221222122111122111112111112126063638
2221203		1011	22222222222221221111121111121111091323243637
2221203	05	11	2222222221222222111122111112111111216091036
222 304	06040511		222222222122212211211221111121111132023243334
222220401		11	2222222221222122111112111112111112126083637
222120402		0511	222222222122222211111211111211111041430263336
222120401		11	22222222212221221111121111121111111625063236
31313030	06060211		21112 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1011017052231
3231304	1811		2222222221222122 12221122211121111131723112528
3432202	010611		2211222221122112 11111121112121111020405162131
323 203	07	11	2211112221222122 11122211 22221111111719053138
323120502	06	11	22111122211221121111111111121111010617153637
3131202	03	11	222122222112212211212221211121211041113222936
323120406		11	222222222122212211111221111121111030417123032
323120403		11	22222222212221221111122111112111111216171832
3232204		11	2222222221222122111112 111111211111041726101833
323120501	07	11	2111121111111121111111111121111091721111537
3131201	08030211		2212122222122112211222122121222221021017153637
3132102020202		11	2211111221221111111111111122211101733112937
31313010509031111			121111111121212 1111111111121111081727111521
343110606		11	2111211211121112 11111111211121111091724051522
323120608		0111	222222222122212211 221 21112 211101417192229
3431205		0611	22212211211211221111111111111111021017263237
3131204	05	0311	2221121121111122111111111111111101418152628
3431205		1211	222112112111111211121111111111111021014152632
323130510		0511	12111211 11212122 2222112111122211101727052829
32312010110		11	221112122112111211221112211121111020817031522
313140519		0211	2111211211111111211121111121121101317153136
3231402	08100811		22111111111111211111111111211211171820033137
3231301	08	11	222222222222222111122121 2221111091417030507
1411208	040104		12111211111111212212121111112111131432102122
1211203	04	0404	22 1 22221211 21111111111121111193344272829
1411103	0804		212 2122211211111211121111111111162628102287
121110202	0204		111111111111212111211111111111033246102728
1211104	0504		1211111111112111111111111121111193344203540
121130914	140604		211111111121112111111111111111192646062947
1212414	04010804		222122222111112111111111111111222935111725
1211424	040604		111111111111211111111111111111052932101722
121 3060703	0804		121111111111212111111111111111323538244647
1212203		0804	121111111111111111111111111111323738010317
121 203	140504		221111111121112111111111111111272829172022
1211206	1004		222222222122212211111221111121111181933444647
1211204	080504		2211111111211121111111111111112111872829151722

1 1			04	2222222221222122111112211111121111070811131922
1212314	03		04	2222222221222122111111111111121111070825394446
121 308	16		04	2211112121221122111111111111121111062327102225
1211420	04		04	2211112221222122111112211111121111010203173439
1211202		1204		2211112221221122212212221111121111193344172547
121241402		0504		2222222221222122112222211111121111052232274647
1212204	05		1004	1211111111112122111111111111111111053238414647
1212206		1104		1211111111111211111111111111121111053238273941
1212315		050204		2222222221222122111112211111121111070841042227
121131202	07		04	12111122212221221122111111121111010239173147
222 313			04	222222222222222111112222121121111050917112730
2221311		08	04	222 2222222112112212121111121111123235202228
2221511	2904		04	22 1222221222122112212111211121111203538242729
2222208			04	2222222212221221212222222222222222041720272829
2222210			04	222222222122212212222222222222222080917272829
222141101	16		04	2211222231121112112222211211221111323839061023
2221321	0401		04	22212222122212211211221111122112071626011223
2422101	04		04	222222221222122112112221211222211323941253134
222131510	10		04	222222222222122111112211211121111092632242747
222 204			04	222222222122212211112211111121111172542272829
2221102			04	22211222122212211112211111121111172542101327
2222420			04	22222222122212211112211111211111010304222429
2222215	07		04	22222222222222211111111111111111172542272829
2221309	12		04	22222222222212211112211111121111172025272829
222 311	10		04	2222222221222122111112211111121111050936242749
222120406	03		04	2222222221222122111112211111121111041731272829
2222203			04	222222221222122111112211111121111323442244647
2222312	08		04	2222222221222122111112211111121111173238272829
2221208	0404		04	2222222221222122111112111111121111141626414647
222120605	03		04	2222222221222122111112211111121111173142101123
2222309	0408		04	2222222221222122111112211111121111172542272829
2221306	0305		04	2222222212221221111111111111111051643334647
2221 15	04		04	222222222222122111112221211121111010203121722
2221412	14		04	2222222221222222111111111111121111203234122245
222230803	06		04	22222222222212221222222111121111051443414647
2222208	04		04	222222222222122211111211111121111173032111222
323130711	0804		04	221122222112111211221112111122211071632122734
3231302	1510		04	1111112211121112111111211122111072034172327
313131803			04	2221122221221112111112211111121111163235242747
3431202		0404		22222222222212211111222211221111080932272947
3231208			04	222112122112111211111111111111111193344062227
31314072102010204			04	2221 22221112122112111111111111111083246022143
313140404	0516		04	112122221112112211211111111111121111031946051127
3232407	20		04	2222222221222122111112211111121111152132272829
3231310	05		04	2222222221222122111112211111121111050918194446
323220703	04		04	2222222221222122111111111111121111202132122223
3231103	0205		04	2222222221222122111112211111121111051620272829
3231202	0308		04	222222222122212211111221111112 11071117132746
3232315	05		04	2222222221222112112212211111121111203132124647
323130504	01		04	22222221122211211111211111121111010509111222
323120802	03		04	2222222212221221111111111111111252630132245
1211202	08		12	22222222122212211112221221122111020325141626
1412101		0312		2111222221222122111111111222221182022162031
121 410	12		12	22212222212211111122211112111101323161619
1211307	03		12	22112222212111211221122111121112040509162629

1111203	1212	2221122221222122212211111211122221022425141828
1212201	08 12	2222222221222122111112211111211111142934133335
121 410	15 12	2222222221222122111112211111211111131823333435
121230204	0412	2211111111121112212111211122212082528111720
1411204	0612	2211111111211112221221111122221122233041020
212120402	02 12	2221 2 1 2
2221117	07 12	2221 1 2
2221206	12	2222222222212211111111111121111182331101335
2222407	130612	211122221222 2211221122111122111070911132735
2221304	110212	22222222122212211111221111221111091015161927
22224060312	0312	2222222222212211221222122221221152129021335
222120604	12	221122222112112211112211211121211152132272935
2222308	01 12	222222222221221112111111111111061532101316
222120104	12	22222222122212211111221111121111152026132733
2221407	03 2012	222112222112122212212212211122222021725262728
222120602	12	22 22 2 2 11 22 1 111112 11
2222203	06 12	2222222212221221111111111121111152729103435
2221309	080312	2211111211222112112221221122211011823143335
2221208	10 12	222222221222122112212 1122212 211061923021430
222 203	12	2222222222212211111111111121111061924102235
2222102	01 12	22222222112212211221121111122221061415023335
2222204	04 12	2222222211221221111112211112222152132020535
2421102	02 12	221111222112212211222222111122221062931023335
2222205	12	222222221122122222222212222222141532032627
313130620	100512	22211212211212121122111111121111010322132133
3232405	05 12	221 222222221 1111111111121111152329333435
3231311	15 12	222112222222222211121221111121111021525111630
323120402	12	22222222122212211221221111121111152327133435
3632308	12	22222222222122112211111112 1011531212629
323 04	12	222222222 1221111111111121111061529033335
3231306	1212	22222222122212211111221111121111070809193435
323 30604	04 12	222222221122122112222121121211121070828031232
1211104	0510	212222221222112112221111211122211101723010912
1212306	060610	221112222112111211111111112211110413170825
1211202	08 10	211222222122122122222122222222142023081315
1212405	3010	22111111111111211111111111111111111161723
1212203	1010	2222222212221221111111111122111040517
1212201	1210	21111111111111111111111111111111111161718031114
1212303	12 10	22222222122212211112211111211111010406071524
1212205	0610	22222222122212211112211111211111032227081524
121	10	221111111112111211222122211122222051422011015
1211303	02 1010	221111111112111211222222111122222071624010309
212110105	0110	2222 2221 2 22112211 111112 111021923010715
222140808	10	22 2222 221 11121211141623081324
2221207040101010	10	22222222122212211222211211122211031214091924
222140910	130210	22222222 2221221111221111121111141920071523
222110204	03 10	22222222122212211222112111122211031417060924
2222101	05 10	222122222222122112111211211211021618040927
2221207	05 10	22212221222112111112 111122211161721040726
212120204	02 10	221122222122212222222221112221071718050922
222120201	09 10	2111122 11111211111221121122111071217151623
2221101	0110	2222222222221221122222221122211021016011117
222220402	05 10	222222222221221111221111121111071115040924
222220703	08 10	22222222122122111122111112111112111216040924
2221306	10 10	222222221222122111221111121111071112040924

2222204		10	2222222211221222222222221222222222065912102426
2222304		10	2222222211221221122212222211122222010615
2222204		10	2211112221121122112121222111122222010608101920
2221103		10	22212222112212211212111111122222021618082426
2222204	04	10	0204080910207
2422204	04	10	22111222112212211222122111122222060718010910
222220304		10	2221212221121122112112211111122222111215102324
3231204		10	22111111112111211222222111122222161824101520
323120501	09	10	22121222112221221122211222111222111417071015
3232104		10	222122222222122112212111211111211101722040924
32321	04	10	2211211121121112112112221211121211031017061219
343110304	07	10	2222222222222111111222111121111141720152425
3231102		10	2221222222221121111111211122111031417021519
323120805	04	10	221221222112112211222211211122211031617020824
3231205		10	22222222112212211222122211112222030609011216
3131307	07	10	22212222212221221121111111111161722071523
323205	10	10	2222222212221221111122111112211111122304224

ENTRY

APPENDIX D

TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL AND UNIVERSITY  
PARALLEL PROGRAMS OFFERED BY  
THE PARTICIPATING  
JUNIOR COLLEGES

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Western Oklahoma State College

Accounting	Physical Education
Agri-Business	Pre-Professional
Airport Management	Psychology
Art	Secretarial Administration
Aviation	Social Studies
Biology	Speech & Drama
Business Administration	Fire Fighting Technology
Business Economics	Child Care Administration
Business Education	Construction Technology
Commercial Art	
Cooperative Business	
Corrections	
Drafting & Design	
Elementary Education	
English	
Foreign Language	
General Physical Sciences	
General Science	
General Studies	
Humanities	
Journalism	
Law Enforcement	
Mathematics	
Medical Secretary	
Mid-Management	
Music	

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Oscar Rose Junior College

Accounting	Medical Laboratory Technology
Aeronautical Technology	Mid Management
Air Traffic Control Mgt.	Music
Art	Nursing Transfer
Biological Sciences	Office Administration
Business	Physical Education
Business Administration	Physical Science
Court Reporting	Pre Dentistry
Data Processing	Pre Engineering
Dental Hygiene	Pre Medicine
Dietetic Technology	Pre Pharmacy
Drama	Psychology
Early Childhood Guidance	Radiologic Technology
Education	Real Estate/Insurance
Electromechanical Tech.	Respiratory Therapy
Electronics Technology	Secretarial Admin.-General
English	Secretarial Admin.-Legal
Engineering Mechanics Tech.	Secretarial Admin.-Medical
Environmental Sciences	Social Services-Corrections
Fluids Technology	Social Science
Foreign Language	Speech
Home Economics	Native American Studies
Industrial Drafting & Des.	Secretarial Administration
Journalism	General Clerical
Legal Assistant	Banking & Finance
Logistics Mid Management	Histologic Technology
Mathematics	Dental Laboratory Technology

---

 Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Northern Oklahoma College

Accounting Associate	Language Arts
Agri-Business	Law
Agri-Production	Law Enforcement
Agriculture	Mathematics
Art	Medical Laboratory Technology
Biological Sciences-Zoology	Medical Secretary
Business Administration	Pre-Medicine
Business Records	Music
Chemistry	Pre-Nursing
Community Mental Health	Nursing, R.N.
Data Processing	Pre-Pharmacy
Drafting-Design Technology	Printing
Electro-Certificate	Printing Technology
Electronics Technology	Secondary Education
Elementary Education	Secretarial Administration
Pre-Engineering	Secretarial Science
English	Social Science
Fashion Merchandise	Speech
General Business	Stenography
General Engineering Technology	Wood Utilization Technology
General Industrial Technology	Cabinet Making
General Studies - Arts	Community Journalism
General Studies - Science	Computer Science
Home Economics	Interior Design
Physical Education H, Pe, & R	Mid Management
Industrial Arts - Art	Natural Sciences
Industrial Arts - Graphic Art	Physics
Industrial Arts - Metals	Residential Construction Technology
Industrial Arts - Wood Utilization	Speech, Broadcasting, Communications
Journalism	Speech, Radio Broadcasting, Mid Management

## Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Northeastern Oklahoma A&amp;M College

Accounting	Journalism
Agriculture	Law-Pre
Air Conditioning/Refrigeration	Legal Secretary
Art	Machine Shop
Auto Technology	Marketing & Management
Aviation	Medical Secretary
Biology Sciences	Medicine-Pre Professional
Business Administration	Music
Physical Sciences	Nurses Assistant
Child Care	Nursing-Pre
Computer Science	Nursing/Associate Degree
Construction	Philosophy
Criminal Justice	Physical Education & Recreation
Drafting & Design	Psychology
Drama & Theatre	Ranch Management
Education/Elementary	Secretarial Science
Education/Secondary	Social Science
Electromechanical Technology	Social Work
Electronics Technology	Speech
Engineering-Pre	Technical Theatre
English	Technology General
Fashion Trades	Veterinary Medicine-Pre
Forestry	Welding
Geology	Wildlife Management
Home Economics	Horticulture
Home Economics-Vocational	Community Journalism
Hotel Motel Management	Graphic Arts

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by El Reno Junior College

Accounting	Pre-Agriculture
Accounting Technology	Pre-Professional
Aviation	Pre-Education
Business	Pre-Engineering
Chemistry	Pre-Law
Commercial Art Technology	Law Enforcement
Corrections	Pre-Nursing
English	Psychology
Fine Arts	Secretarial Science
Geology	Sociology
History	Speech
Home Economics	Zoology
Industrial Technology	Nursing
Journalism	Marketing & Merchandising
Liberal Arts	Mid Management
Mathematics	Law Enforcement (A.A.S.)
Physics	Medical & Dental Secretary
Physical Education	Legal Secretary
Political Science	Social Services-Corrections Opt.
Child Development	

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Seminole Junior College

Art	Mathematics
Behavioral Science	Music
Business	Life Science
Child Development	Nursing
Computer Science	Physical Science
Elementary Education	Political Science/Pre-Law
Health, Physical Education and Recreation	Pre-Engineering
Home Economics	Pre-Medical and Pre-Pharmacy
Journalism Technology	Secretarial Science
Law Enforcement	Social Studies
Liberal Arts	Turf/Nursery Technology
Language Arts and Humanities	Special Students
Mid-Management	Emergency Medical Technology
	Accounting Technology

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by South Oklahoma City Junior College

Corrections	Pre-Engineering
Banking and Finance	Psychology
Broadcasting	Recreational Leaders
Business	Science
Child Development	Secretarial Science
Commercial Art	Speech Communication
Diversified Studies	Sociology
Drafting and Design	Surgical Technology
Electronics	Theatre Arts
Emergency Medical Technology	Visual Arts
History	Accounting Associate
Literature	Credit Union Management
Mathematics	Drug Abuse Rehab. Counseling
Mid-Management	Fashion Merchandising
Modern Languages	General Office Assistant
Music	Production Technology
Nursing	Radio/TV Repair
Occupational Therapy-Recreation	Real Estate
Political Science/Pre-Law	Retail Merchandising



Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Claremore Junior College

Business	Music
Business Management & Administration	Physics
Child Development	Political Science
Engineering	Pre-Nursing
Art	Pre-Pharmacy
Health, Physical Education, & Recreation	Psychology
Journalism	Speech
Mathematics	Banking & Finance
Police Science	Graphics Technology
Pre Law	Horse Ranch Management
Pre-Medical-Dental	Country Western Music
Secretarial Studies-Associate	Recreation
Secretarial Studies-Certificate	Radio Communications
Sociology	Social-Psychology
Construction and Building Mgt.	
Horticulture Technology	
Environmental Science	
Biological Sciences	
Business Education	
Chemistry	
Drama	
Education - Elementary	
Education - Secondary	
English	
Food Services	
History	
Liberal Arts	
Medical Assistant (Office)	

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Eastern Oklahoma State College

Agriculture Education	Journalism
Agronomy	Mathematics
Animal Sciences & Industry	Mechanical Eng. Tech. (Auto)
Art	Mechanical Eng. Tech. (Machine)
Biological Sciences	Mechanical Eng. Tech. (Welding)
Building Design & Construction	Mid-Management
Business Administration	Music
Business Education	Nursing
Physical Sciences	Forest Tech. (Parks Management)
Civil Highway Technology	Physical Education
Computer Technology	Pre-Professional
Early Childhood Care	Medical Technology-Trans
Electromechanical	Nursing-Trans
Electronics	Psychology or Sociology
Elementary Education	Ranch Operation Technology
Engineering	Secondary Education
English	Secretarial Training
Forestry (ES)	Speech or Drama
Forest Technology (Timber)	Wildlife Conservation
History or Political Science	Forest Tech. (Arboriculture)
Home Economics	Instrumentation Technology
Industrial Chemical Technology	Agriculture Meats Technology
Industrial Drafting & Design	Mechanized Agriculture Technology
Industrial Education	

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Tulsa Junior College

Biological Sciences	Machinist Technology
Physical Sciences	Market Merchandising
Business Administration	Medical Laboratory-Applied
Pre-Pro-Health Related	Medical Laboratory Tech.
General Studies	Medical Assistant-Applied
Engineering	Medical Assistant
Art	Medical Secretary-Applied
Music	Medical Secretary
Pre-Pro-Education	Medical Transcriptionist
Theatre Arts	Mid-Management-Applied
Communications	Mid-Management
Mathematics	Nursery-Horticulture Tech.
Foreign Language	Nursing-TJC Applicant
Social & Behavioral Sciences	Nursing-TJC
Agri-Business	Physical Therapy Program
Banking/Finance	Physical Therapy Asst. Program
Bookkeeping	Police Science
Computer Operator	Professional Real Estate
Computer Programmer	Quality Control Tech.
Credit Union	Residential/Commercial Const.
Culinary Arts	Radiologic Tech.-Applied
Drafting/Design Technology	Radiologic Technology
Electro-Mechanical Technology	Professional Secretary
Electronics Technology	Savings and Loan
Food Dist. Specialist (Supermarket)	Small Business Management
Fire Protection Technology	Surveying
General Office Assistant	Transportation/Traffic Mgt.
Health Care Supervisor	Welding Technology
Hotel/Restaurant Management	Bio-Medical Equip. Tech.
Respiratory Therapy-Applied	Programmer Analyst
Respiratory Therapy	Insurance
Instrument Technology	Industrial Security
Accountant Associate	Legal Assistant
Legal Secretary-Applied	Postal Ser. Leadership Dev.
Legal Secretary	Purchasing Management
Labor Leadership	Safety Technology

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Carl Albert Junior College

Accounting	Mathematics
Art	Medical-Dental Secretary
Auto Service Management	Mid-Management
Biological Sciences	Music
Business Education	Office Administration
Business Management	Physical Sciences
Commercial Art	Pre-Engineering
Construction Management	Pre-Law
Drafting	Pre-Medical, Pre-Pharmacy,
Early Childhood Care	Pre-Veterinary
Elementary Education	Pre-Nursing
English	Professional Secretary
Health, Physical Education, & Recreation	Psychology-Sociology
Heating/Air Conditioning	Real Estate & Insurance Option (Mid-Management)
Home Economics	Secretarial Education
Industrial Education	Social Sciences
Journalism	Business Administration
Junior Accounting	Speech & Drama
Legal Secretary	

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Murray State College

___ Agriculture	___ Mechanical Technology
___ Agriculture Education	___ Metallurgical Technology
___ Art	___ Mid Management
___ Business Administration	___ Nursing
___ Business Education	___ Physical Education & Coaching
___ Chemistry	___ Pre-Pharmacy
___ Conservation & Wildlife Mgmt.	___ Pre-Professional
___ Drafting & Design Technology	___ Pre-Veterinary Medicine
___ Electronics Technology	___ Professional Secretary
___ Electro-Mechanical Technology	___ Respiratory Therapy
___ Engineering	___ Science
___ Farm & Ranch Management	___ Elementary Teaching
___ General Education	___ Wildlife Ecology
___ General Technology	___ Business Administration
___ History	___ Data Processing
___ Home Economics	___ Veterinary Assistant Technology
___ Industrial Arts Technology	___ Construction & Building Design
___ Journalism	___ Indian Studies
___ Mathematics	___ Police Science

Technical-Occupational and University Parallel Programs Offered by Connors State College

___ Agriculture	___ Pre-Elementary Education
___ Art Education	___ Pre-Journalism
___ Botany	___ Pre-Professional
___ Business Accounting	___ Secondary Education
___ Business Administration	___ Sociology
___ Business Education	___ Zoology
___ Business Secretarial	___ Waterway Law Enforcement
___ Business/General	___ Pre-Law
___ Chemical Technology	___ Social Work
___ Drafting-Design Technology	___ Physical Sciences
___ Electronic Technology	___ Mid Management
___ Engineering	___ Agri Business
___ English	___ Bio-Sciences
___ History	___ Corrections
___ Home Economics	___ Library Sciences
___ Law Enforcement	___ Money & Banking
___ Mathematics	___ Park & Leisure Property Mgmt.
___ Medical Secretarial	___ Psychology
___ Medical Laboratory Technology	___ Speech
___ Music	___ Special Education
___ Physical Education	___ Wildlife
___ Early Childhood Care	

VITA 2

Robert V. Keck

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Education

Thesis: A COMPARISON OF JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATOR'S  
PERCEPTIONS TOWARD POSTSECONDARY TECHNICAL-  
OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

Major Field: Vocational-Technical and Career  
Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Weleetka, Oklahoma, January  
4, 1933, the son of Arley and Dollie Keck.

Education: Graduated from Weleetka High School,  
Weleetka, Oklahoma, in 1952; received an Associate  
Degree from Eastern Oklahoma State College in  
1954; received the Bachelor of Science in Indus-  
trial Education Degree from the University of  
Oklahoma in 1956; received Masters of Industrial  
Education Degree from the University of Oklahoma,  
1957; completed requirements for the Doctor of  
Education Degree at Oklahoma State University in  
1978.

Professional Organizations: The Council of North  
Central Community Junior Colleges, American  
Association of Community and Junior Colleges, The  
Council for Occupational Education, The Higher  
Education Alumni Council of Oklahoma, American  
Vocational Association, Oklahoma Vocational  
Association, American Technical Association, Oklahoma  
Technical Society, Oklahoma Council of Local  
Administrators, National Council of Local Adminis-  
trators, Phi-Delta Kappa, Iota Lambda Sigma,  
The Red Red Rose; and Oklahoma Adult and Continuing  
Education Association.

Professional Experience: Draftsman for the Oklahoma  
State Highway Department, 1954-55; Engineering  
Correspondent for Linde Air Division of Union Carbon

and Carbide Corporation, 1956-57; Graduate Assistant for the University of Oklahoma, 1957; Assistant Professor for the University of Oklahoma, 1957-64; Visiting Professor for Oklahoma State University, 1964; Assistant Director of Vocational Education for the Oklahoma City Public Schools, 1964-66; Director of Vocational Education for the Oklahoma City Public Schools, 1966-67; Director of Technical Education for Eastern Oklahoma State College, 1967-68; Dean of Instruction for Eastern Oklahoma State College, 1968-69; Dean of Technical Education for Eastern Oklahoma State College, 1969-73; Consultant-Examiner for the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges, 1972-75; Coordinator of Technical Education for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 1973-present.

Leadership Activities: Executive Secretary, Executive Vice-President, President and Board of Director of the Oklahoma Technical Society; President of the Oklahoma Council of Local Administrators; Board of Director of the Oklahoma Vocational Association; Secretary Plains Region American Technical Association; Vice-President of the Wilburton Lions Club; Chairman of Education Committee for the Wilburton Chamber of Commerce; Director of the Southeastern Oklahoma Boy Scouts of America; President of Weleetka High School Senior Class; Sponsor of the Industrial Education Club at the University of Oklahoma; President of the Industrial Education Club at the University of Oklahoma.