

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that the family members' expectations of 22 students (73.3%) were influential in the field selection and 1 student (3.3%) was undecided. Only 7 students (23.2%) appeared to have made the field selection without being affected by the family expectations.

5. In the table below, the distributions of the impact of the economic levels of the students in the sample on the field selection are given.

Table 6. The distributions of the economic levels' impact of the students in the sample.

Categories	Codes	N	%
The effect of the economic level	Definitely effective. (S3,S5,S9,S24,S29,)	5	16.6
	Effective. (S2,S6,S10,S11,S15,S18,S21,S22)	8	26.6
	Undecided. (S1,S4,S13,S17,S25,S26,S30)	7	23.3
	Not effective. (S7,S8,S12,S19,S23,S27)	6	20
	Definitely not effective. (S14,S16,S20,S28)	4	13.3

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that the income levels of the 13 students (43.2%) had an impact on the field selection, while 10 students (33.3%) had selected the field without being affected by the economic level of their families and 7 students (23.3%) were undecided. From this, it turns out that the income level of the family does not have the estimated influence on the field selection.

6. In the table below, the distributions of the impact of the field selection of the close friends of the students in the sample are given.

Table 7. The distributions of the impact of close friends' selection in the sample.

Categories	Codes	N	%
The effect of the close friends' selection	Definitely effective. (S3,S5,S9,S24,S29,)	8	26.6
	Effective. (S2,S6,S10,S11,S15,S18,S21,S22)	7	23.3
	Undecided. (S1, S4,S13,S17,S25,S26,S30)	7	23.3
	Not effective. (S7,S8,S12,S19,S23,S27)	6	20
	Definitely not effective. (S14,S16,S20,S28)	2	6.6

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that the preferences of close friends had an impact on the field selection of the 15 students (50%), 8 students (26.6%) were not affected by their friends and 7 students (23.3%) were undecided. It seems that close friend preferences are more effective than expected.

7. In the table below, the distributions of the teacher's guidance on the field selection are given.

Table 8. The distributions of the teacher's impact on the field selection in the sample.

Categories	Codes	N	%
The effect of the teachers	Definitely effective. (S4,S5,S7,S8,S17,S24,S25,S28,S29)	9	30
	Effective. (S1,S3,S6,S15,S20,S21,S27)	7	23.3
	Undecided. (S2,S9,S10,S11,S12,S13,S16,S22,S23,S30)	10	33.3
	Not effective. (S18,S19,S26)	3	9.9
	Definitely not effective. (S14)	1	3.3

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that 16 students (53.3%) were influenced by their teacher's guidance about the field selection, 10 students (33.3%) showed an undecided attitude and only 4 students (13.2%) made the choice without any influence from the teacher's guidance. From here, it is seen that school teachers have a great influence on students' field selection.

8. In the table below, the distributions of the opinions of the students in the sample about the field selection are given.

Table 9. The distributions of the students' opinion about selecting right field in the sample.

Categories	Codes	N	%
The opinions about the field selection satisfaction	Definitely satisfied. (S3,S5,S8,S9,S10,S13,S17,S18,S19,S24,S25, S26,S28,S29)	14	46.6
	Satisfied. (S1,S2,S4,S6,S7,S12,S14,S15,S20,S21,S23)	11	36.6
	Undecided. (S11,S22,S27,S30)	4	13.3
	Not satisfied. (S16)	1	3.3
	Definitely not satisfied.	-	-

When Table 9 is examined, it is seen that 14 students (46.6%) completely made the correct the field selection, 11 students (36.6%) had the right field selection, 4 students (13%) were undecided and 1 student (3%) did not think that they made the right field selection. It was found that 83.2% of the students in the sample who made the field selection think that they have the correct field.

RESULT, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS

The responses of the students to all the questions were examined by analyzing the contents. When we look at the distribution of male and female students from individuals who do enough research to make the right field selection; 8 male students out of 18 students have made enough research, 9 female students out of 12 students have made enough research about the right field selection. For both genders, when we deal with percentages, the rate of doing enough research in male students is 44% while in female students, it is 75%. From here, we can conclude that the girl students prefer to do more research.

When the awareness of interests and abilities is examined in terms of gender variable; Of the 18 male students, 12 are aware of their interests and ability, whereas of the 12 female students, 11 are aware of the their interests and ability. While the awareness rate in male students is 66%, this rate is 91% in female students. The study conducted by Bozkurt (1994) "Factors Affecting the Professional Orientation of Students in General High Schools and Vocational Schools" revealed that general interest and general ability awareness influenced the field selection. Beklevi (2007) stated that the most important criteria that students value in their professional preferences are their interests and abilities. It has been observed that individuals who are expected to be successful in accordance with their interests and abilities may fail when the course scores are taken into consideration and the opposite situation is observed to be possible in the study conducted by Güler and Yücedağ (2017) with a fuzzy logic based approach.

When the effect of the success on the field selection is examined, it is seen that the course success of 14 male students out of 18 male students is influential in the field selection, while the course success of 5 female students out of 12 female students is influential in the field selection. In males, the effect of course success on the field selection is 77%, while in girls it is 41%. From here, we can say that male students take into account the course success in their field choice compared to girls (about twice as many). On the problems encountered by high school students in the field selection, a study conducted by Kısaç et al. emphasizes the drawbacks of field selection based on the course success, and it is stated that this process must be supported

with student abilities and in addition, it is necessary to increase the motivation of the teachers for guidance (Kısaç, İ., Başerler, D., Başerler Z., and Kaman M, 2015).

When the influence of family members' expectation on the field selection is examined; it was seen that 15 male students were affected by the expectations of their family and 7 female students were affected by family expectations. It is seen that expectations of family members are influential on 83% of male students, and this rate is 58% in female students. It is seen that female students are less affected by the family expectations contrary to the expectations.

In the study conducted by Oskay (1981) as cited in Akdemir (1991), it was possible to mention the predominant effect of the father on the male students, while it is seen that there is a tendency to permit the female students freedom. On the contrary, Bozkurt (1994) stated that there was no significant relationship between parent attitudes and occupational orientation of the students. In the study conducted by Hamamcı et al. (2011) revealed that in traditional societies, the mother is more interested in the educational life of the students, but that the role of the father is more effective on educational and occupational selections. It has been stated that the academic achievement of children who is supported by the families under all conditions in the study called the parental academic support in the education made by Ökten (2016) is increased.

When we examine the effect of income level of the students on the field selection; it turns out that economic levels of 8 male and 5 female students have an impact on the field selection. According to the income level of male students, the rate of field selection is 44% and the rate of female students is 41%. When we look at the general rate, it is understood that more than half of the students decide without considering the income level, while 13 students (43%) consider the income level when deciding. Uysal (1970) and Bölükbaş (1989) found that the income level and the socio-economic level of the family directly affect the field selection of high school students (Cited in Şengün, 2013). Bozkurt (1994) found that income levels were influential in the fields of science and technology, social sciences and fine arts but that there was no significant relation in the fields of medicine, health, economics, literature and language. Aytekin (2005) found that socio-cultural and socio-economic structure, resident-related environmental factors, success status and occupational perception are the most influential factors in the decision-making process.

When we examine the influence of close friend preferences on field selections; 5 male and 3 female students seem to be influenced by the selections of close friends. The influence of close friends is 27% in male students and 25% in female students. When we look at the total, close friends seem to have a lower level of influence on the field selection. Kutlu (2006) stated that, in some researches on occupation selection, the friends have a greater effect than the family members on the field selection (Cited in Kiyak, 2006). In the study conducted by Hamamcı et al., it has been revealed that the selection of close friends are more effective especially in the decision processes of male students compared to female students (Hamamcı et al., 2013).

When we examine the effect of the teachers attending the courses of the students on the field selection, it is seen that 11 male students and 5 female students are affected by the teachers. In male students, the rate of being influenced by teachers was 61%, while the rate of female students affected by teachers was 41%. It can be argued that males take the teacher guidance into consideration more than female students. In the study of Beyhan (2010) examining the factors that influence secondary school students' branch preference, carried out on behalf of the Ministry of National Education, more than half of the students were not affected by the teachers and did not receive professional help, whereas more than half of the students guided by school counselors found this help to be sufficient. At this point it turns out that the most important element of the education system is the teacher and that all the education and teaching processes of the teachers play a key role in planning and implementation (Duman and Karagöz, 2015).

If we examine the subject in line with all the analyzes made; it turns out that the field satisfaction of the female students is %75 when it is considered that the female students are more aware of their interests and abilities, they make the field selection accordingly, they do more preliminary research and are more influenced by their selections in their daily life. For male students; it turns out that the field satisfaction of

the male students is %94 as a result of deciding according to the course success, and considering the family expectations and guidance of the teachers attending their courses.

It is certain that the young individuals do not have difficulty to make field and profession selection when they understand their roles in life, their desires and expectations (Çınar, 2011), and that the individuals gain self-confidence for academic success upon overcoming the concern of performance (Gürşen Otacıoğlu, 2016), and the family, school, individual, society, government, universities, media and business world should shoulder the responsibilities for this essential selection in the period when the personality perception has yet developed (Razon, 1983).

The present study has a few limitations. The limitations are the sample size, the items of questionnaire, types of school and provinces which applied the questionnaire. In order to generalize the outcomes of this study, it is suggested that further researches should be conducted with different types of school, much more elaborated questions and wide range student population. In addition, future research should be expanded by including opinions of groups which affect field selection as teachers, family members, close friends for each student and the distributions of successful courses.

As a result; when we examine the factors affecting the field selection, it is understood that the family should start the field selection process at early ages by examining the development phases of the child; the individual to make the selection should be aware of their interests and abilities; it is crucial to make an extensive research by using the technology in the field selection; it is necessary to consider the expectations of the family members during the research and to consider the course success in the occupational guidance; the school and the teachers should shoulder responsibilities during the guidance; the business world, the non-governmental organizations and media should shoulder responsibilities to raise awareness for the profession branches; the government should shoulder responsibilities in order for the income levels of the students not to affect the field selection and professional carriers of the students with low income level; the selections made in accordance with the interest and ability affect the daily life in a positive manner.

REFERENCES

- Akdemir, Ç. (1991). Okullarımızda mesleki rehberliğin önemi. *Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 1(2), 76-83.
- Aytekin, A. (2005). *Meslek seçimini etkileyen ekonomik ve kültürel faktörler*. Unpublished master's thesis, Süleyman Demirel University, Graduate school of social sciences.
- Bekleviş, F. (2007). *Öğrencilerin mesleki ilgi alanları ve ailenin meslek seçimine etkisi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of social science.
- Beyhan, A. (2010). *Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin alan tercihlerinin incelenmesi*. Ankara: MEB Eğitimi Araştırma ve Geliştirme Dairesi Başkanlığı.
- Bozkurt, E. (1994). Genel liseler ve meslek liseleri öğrencilerinin mesleki yönelimini etkileyen faktörler. *Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi*, 196, 25-28.
- Çam, S., & Işık, T. (2010). İlköğretimde yönlendirme öneri formu uygulamasının öğrencilerin okul ve alan seçimlerine etkisi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19(2), 71 - 84.
- Duman, T. & Karagöz, S. (2016). An evaluation of Turkish teacher education system compared to other models in different countries. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 1(1), 1-13.
- Güler, O. & Yücedağ, İ. (2017). Mesleki ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin alan seçimi problemlerine bulanık mantık temelli yaklaşım. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 32(1), 111-122.

Gürşen-Otacıoğlu, S. (2016). Performance anxiety and academic success level examination of students in Turkey. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 1(2), 25-33.

Hamamcı, Z., Bacanlı, F. & Doğan, H. (2011). *İlköğretim, ortaöğretim ve üniversite öğrencilerinin mesleki ve eğitsel kararlarını etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi*. XI. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, 3-5 Ekim 2011, İzmir.

İsmailoğlu, L. (1990). *Farklı sosyoekonomik düzeydeki lise son sınıf öğrencilerinin meslekleri algulamaları*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ankara University, Graduate school of social sciences.

Karadeniz, A. (1994). *Lise son sınıf öğrencileri üzerinde demokratik ve otoriter olarak algulanan ana-baba tutumlarıyla çeşitli mesleki değerler arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Karadeniz Technical University, Institute of social science.

Kısaç, İ., Başerer, D., Başerer, Z., & Kaman M. (2015). *Mesleki ve teknik anadolu lisesi öğrencilerinin alan ve dal seçiminde karşılaştığı sorunlar konusunda okul yöneticilerinin görüşleri (Ankara Ve Kastamonu Örneği)*. XIII. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, 7-9 Ekim 2015, Mersin.

Kıyak, S. (2006). *Genel lise öğrencilerinin meslek seçimi yaparken temel aldığı kriterler*. Unpublished master's thesis, Yeditepe University, Graduate school of social sciences.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, (MEB). (2003). *İlköğretimde yöneltme yönergesi*. *Tebliğler Dergisi*, 2552.

Ökten, P. (2016). Parental academic support in education. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 1(2), 18-24.

Pişkin, M. (2012). Kariyer gelişim sürecini etkileyen faktörler. B. Yeşilyaprak (Ed.), *Mesleki rehberlik ve kariyer danışmanlığı kuramdan uygulamaya içinde* (s. 44-73). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Razon, N. (1983). Meslek seçiminde aileye, okula, bireye ve topluma düşen görevler. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 44.

Şengün, G. (2013). *Lise öğrencilerinin alan seçimini etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ankara University, Institute of educational science.

Uzer, A.S. (1987). *Lise öğrencilerinin yükseköğretim programlarını tercihleri ile kendi yetenek, ilgi ve mesleki uygunluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkiler*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Graduate school of social sciences.

Ülkü, S. (1977). *Okullarda rehberlik yöneltme kavramı çerçevesi içinde sınırlandırılabilir mi ? sorusuna ilişkin görüşler*. Rehberlik Ve Psikolojik Danışma Hizmetleri Konferansı, 28-30 Nisan 1977, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.