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The purposes of this study were to determine the employment status of North Texas State University clothing and textiles majors who graduated between 1969 and 1978 and to provide a measurement of their job satisfaction. The data were gathered through two mailed questionnaires, a general one developed by the researcher, and the Job Descriptive Index, a standardized job satisfaction index.

Graduates in clothing and textiles tended to seek and obtain employment related to their major field of study, and they are generally satisfied with their jobs. Factors tested statistically in this study included age, marital status, parental status, salary, tenure, and organization size. No significant differences in job satisfaction or employment status were evident relative to any of these factors.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Assuming that a college curriculum is designed to adequately prepare a person for a specific career, the purposes of this study were (1) to determine if graduates in clothing and textiles from North Texas State University are employed in positions related to their major, and if so, (2) to provide a measurement of their job satisfaction. The results of this study provide a record of employment status of past graduates and a measure of the job satisfaction they are experiencing.

Investigation of employment status provides a limited basis of projection for determining the likelihood of graduates in clothing and textiles finding jobs related to their major field. Weid, in his study of industrial arts graduates, states, "Every organization is interested in the degree of success, achievement or acceptance of its product. . . . The product of the colleges and universities is the graduate who enters the occupational field or profession for which he has been studying" (4, p. 4). This study provides some guidelines for home economics personnel in counseling students as they select various fields of study and formulate career goals. Records of past graduates provide input useful in
advising future students regarding possible success in finding employment related to their major field of study. Mattil commented, "An educational program that does not produce the kinds of students who will fit into the labor force of the future will not serve the needs of the economic system" (2, p. 5). Investigating the experiences of past students is one of the first steps in preparing for future students.

The measure of job satisfaction has even greater implications. The university systems are concerned that graduates find satisfaction in their occupations. This is evidenced by numerous research studies conducted by universities that attempt to measure job satisfaction of graduates.

Job satisfaction appears to be related not only to employment, but also to satisfaction with life in general. According to Graham, "There is some evidence that job satisfaction is at least partly responsible for satisfaction with life ... that is, an individual's satisfaction is determined by his total situation at work, home, play, and in all other aspects of his life (1, p. 544).

The researchers associated with the Cornell Studies of Job Satisfaction, which resulted in the development of the Job Descriptive Index, state that understanding satisfaction and dissatisfaction "has important implications for mental health as well as the fact that these factors affect the feelings, attitudes and behaviors of employees" (3, p. 3).
They further remarked, "Improvement of satisfaction is of humanitarian value. Trite as it may seem, satisfaction is a legitimate goal in itself" (3, p. 3).

Justification of the Study

The extensive growth of the clothing and textiles program at North Texas State University during recent years indicated a need for this research study. The total number of clothing and textiles graduates grew continuously from eight in 1972 to forty-two in 1976. In 1968, the number of majors was sixty-five; by 1978, this number had increased to over 270.

The greatest percentage of growth has been in the merchandising option, with an increase of over 150 majors from 1974 to 1978. With this growth, several changes have been made in the merchandising program to more adequately prepare students for careers. Continual changes are needed to keep the program current with the needs of the industry. Changes are evident throughout the clothing and textiles program, not just in merchandising. In 1973, the clothing and textiles major was divided into four options: (1) merchandising, (2) clothing and textiles with a business minor, (3) apparel design, and (4) housing. Before this date, a clothing and textiles major was available with a minor in art, journalism, or business administration. No other breakdown was made. For fall 1978, a new major was added to clothing and textiles,
providing an option in industrial management. Revision of the merchandising program in 1977 created two new courses designed to more adequately meet the needs of students and industry. The growth and development of the clothing and textiles program provide justification for researching the employment status and job satisfaction of clothing and textiles graduates.

Objectives of the Study

The purposes of this study were to explore the employment status of graduates in clothing and textiles from North Texas State University from 1969 to 1978 and to provide a measurement of their job satisfaction. The following objectives were proposed for this study:

1. To determine the type of job in which graduates are employed and classify these jobs as related or unrelated to their college major;

2. To provide a measurement of the job satisfaction level of the employed graduates using the Job Descriptive Index;

3. To describe the population through the responses to the general questionnaire looking at age, marital status, parental status, ages of children, college graduation dates, employment status, hours worked per week, employment record, reasons for unrelated employment, salary, tenure, and organization size;
4. To explore the relationship between the job satisfaction and (a) age, (b) marital status, (c) presence of children in the home, (d) salary level, (e) tenure, (f) size of the employer organization, and (g) employment status;

5. To explore the relationship between employment status and (a) age, (b) marital status, (c) presence of children in the home, (d) salary level, (e) tenure, and (f) size of the employer organization.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested by this study:

1. Graduates employed in fields related to their college major score significantly higher on the Job Descriptive Index than those employed in jobs unrelated to their college major.

2. There is a significant difference in Job Descriptive Index scores for different age groups.

3. Single graduates score significantly higher on the Job Descriptive Index than married graduates.

4. Graduates without children at home score significantly higher on the Job Descriptive Index than graduates who have children present in the home.

5. There is a significant difference in Job Descriptive Index scores for different salary levels.

6. There is a significant difference in Job Descriptive Index scores for different levels of tenure.
7. There is a significant difference in the Job Descriptive Index scores according to the size of the organization for which the graduate is employed.

8. There is a significant difference in age, marital status, parental status, tenure, salary level or size of the employer organization for graduates employed in a related field as opposed to those in an unrelated field.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made concerning this research study:

1. All of the clothing and textiles graduates from 1969 to 1978 were included in the mailing.

2. The school records of names and addresses were current, accurate, and complete.

3. The Job Descriptive Index is a valid measure of job satisfaction.

4. The information given by respondents on the questionnaires is accurate and truthful.

Limitations

The results of this study were limited by the following factors:

1. The measurement of job satisfaction was limited to the instrument used to gather the data.

2. The data obtained were limited by the availability of current addresses for the graduates.
3. The data were limited to the returned questionnaires.

**Delimitations**

The following limitations were placed on this study by the researcher:

1. The study was limited to graduates in clothing and textiles from North Texas State University who graduated between January, 1969 and August, 1978.

2. The relationship existing between job satisfaction and social factors has been the subject of numerous studies. Also, the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity has been studied extensively. Both of these factors are beyond the scope of this research, due to the great difficulty involved in measuring them.

3. Educational level and sex differences were not measured by this study, due to the fact that all respondents have a college degree and all are female.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions are applicable:

1. Employment status is defined as the type of job presently held by the subject.

2. Job satisfaction is defined as the favorable attitude of a worker towards his or her job. Dissatisfaction indicates
an unfavorable attitude. Scores on the Job Descriptive Index are used to indicate satisfaction/dissatisfaction levels.

3. **Major field** refers to the field of concentration within the clothing and textiles major in which the student majored.

4. **Success** refers to the ability of the graduates to obtain employment that relates to their college major, not to their promotion rate or to their ability to perform.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Employment Status of College Graduates

The interest in college graduates and their ability to find employment is evidenced by a number of studies dealing with this topic. In 1974, Parrish and Duff surveyed over 12,000 college graduates in Illinois to determine their employment experiences. They found the unemployment rate to be 4.6 per cent for all graduates which was below the 4.9 national rate for 1973. In measuring satisfaction, only 13 per cent of the employed respondents indicated dissatisfaction with their jobs. Most of the graduates were successful in finding jobs related to their major; only 16 per cent failed to do so (37).

The College Placement Council reported in 1977 that most college graduates surveyed were satisfied with their jobs, with those in high-level jobs expressing more satisfaction than those who viewed their job as nonprofessional. The study also found that those who had jobs related to their major field of study were no more satisfied than others. The women in the study reported satisfaction levels equal to the men even though discrepancies in salary and job level status were recognized. Results showed that recent women graduates
were less complacent about these discrepancies than were women graduates of the 1960's (36).

A number of clothing and textiles majors seek employment in retailing and merchandising fields. Retailing is the third largest industry in the United States and is known for employing a large number of women. In 1968 almost half of retail employees were women. Other characteristics of the retailing field are low starting salaries, long hours, lack of prestige, high pressure jobs, and a high turnover rate (7).

A study was conducted in 1956 to determine why college graduates, who had entered the retailing field, had left the field for other jobs. Salary earned and number of hours worked per week were the two most common complaints of graduates who left retailing. Most of the respondents left retailing after less than three years and entered another business or manufacturing field (8).

Greene surveyed fashion merchandising graduates of Oklahoma State University from 1961 to 1970 to determine their job status. The preliminary results found only about half of the women graduates were employed. Of the employed women, a majority were employed in fields related to merchandising. Of those employed in other fields, 12 per cent had been in merchandising but had left the field for other jobs (18).

Job Satisfaction

Quinn reported on changes in job satisfaction levels in 1973. He stated that Work in America found workers becoming
more dissatisfied with most aspects of their jobs. He further reported that the Gallup Opinion Index showed a drop in job satisfaction levels between 1969 and 1973, but Survey of Working Conditions found no evidence of decline (41).

Many approaches have been taken in past research on job satisfaction. Numerous variables have been identified and measured, with many conflicting results. The measurement of satisfaction is very complex. As Handyside reports, "Job satisfaction is a dynamic process of balancing one thing against another, rather than a static process of having a particular level of all-over satisfaction" (20, p. 219). This dynamic process requires measuring different feelings as they correspond to different aspects of a job, not just a general feeling of over-all satisfaction or dissatisfaction (20).

The general trend in satisfaction research has been to establish a direction and an explanation of the causes and determinants of job satisfaction such as age, education, tenure, performance, salary level, ability, marital status, sex, etc. A more recent trend has been a change in focus from extrinsic factors to intrinsic factors related to individual needs and job content (4).

Marconi states that "research strategies have taken one of two approaches: measuring the determinants of job satisfaction or measuring the consequences" (32, p. 128). The
consequences involve such factors as turnover rates, absenteeism, and performance.

According to Scanlan,

The work role most conducive to job satisfaction is one which provides the following: a) participative supervision, b) opportunity to interact with peers, c) varied duties, d) high pay, e) promotional opportunities, f) control over work methods and pace (45, p. 13).

The dimensions that seem to appear most frequently in job satisfaction literature are the content of the work itself, direct supervision, the organization type, opportunities for advancement, pay and other financial benefits, co-workers, and working conditions (43). These dimensions are covered by the Job Descriptive Index and are explored by this study.

Methods of Job Satisfaction Measurement

One of the problems encountered in job satisfaction research is variations in measurement methodology. Ronan believes the particular methodology used seems to significantly effect research results. Two studies that measure satisfaction are not necessarily highly correlated. With such a wide divergence of measuring tools being used, the likelihood of similarities in results for different studies is negligible (43).

Wanous and Lawler contend that conflicting results reported in various studies are quite likely due to differences in measurement tools used (53). Ronan's review of the numerous measuring tools developed for job satisfaction research
illustrates the diversity that exists. He reports that in 1951, Brayfield and Rothe developed a job satisfaction test using Thurstone and Likert scaling methods (eight-point measure ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree). Later, Smith and Weston developed two satisfaction measures: one was multiple choice and the other sentence completion. Weitz and Nuckols developed a measuring device using direct and indirect questions to predict survival rates among salesmen. In 1960, two similar measures were developed by Froelich and Wolins and Glennon, Owens, Smith. This method involved asking a question about satisfaction with a job aspect and then another question asking the importance of that particular aspect to the respondent. Kunin's "Faces" scale was developed in 1955, and depicted facial expressions to evaluate the subject's attitude toward job aspects. The Cornell Studies of Job Satisfaction, conducted in the 1960's, resulted in the development of the Job Descriptive Index. This measure lists phrases and adjectives which describe a worker's attitude toward specific areas of his job (43).

After intensive research on the desirable characteristics of a measuring device, the Cornell group determined the requirements of a good satisfaction measurement to be as follows:

(1) The measure must be applicable to a wide variety of jobs and situations.
(2) The measure should be inexpensive in dollars and time required for administration.

(3) The measure should be standardized and results comparable from one person to another.

(4) The measure should be reliable, i.e., be reasonably consistent from question to question and from time to time (48).

In developing the Job Descriptive Index, much study was applied to determine which areas of job satisfaction should be included and measured. The final scales were designed around five areas of satisfaction: work, pay, promotions, supervision and co-workers. Smith reports, "We recognize that these factors do not specify completely the general construct of job satisfaction. We feel, however, that these are the five areas which will be most discriminably different for the pool of workers we will be studying" (48, p. 30).

Checklists were developed, studied, tested, and revised to produce final lists. Scoring decisions were based on triadic comparisons of three job descriptions: the worker's present job, the job he would most like to have (his best job), and the job he would least like to have (his worst job). Smith believes, "this procedure assumes that the psychological distance between the worker's present and his best and worst jobs is a main determinant of his satisfaction" (48, p. 34). A graphic scale was tested as well as Kunin's "Faces" scale and a "Boxes Scale" to measure the extent of
feelings toward certain job aspects before the index was finalized. These four separate investigations were performed, all measuring satisfaction per se, not performance. The result of this extensive study, testing and comparison was the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (48).

The JDI has several advantages as a measure of job satisfaction: (a) it is directed toward specific areas of satisfaction rather than general satisfaction, (b) the verbal level required to answer the questions is quite low, (c) the JDI does not ask how satisfied one is with his work, but rather asks him to describe his work; this gives a job-referent rather than a self-referent, and (d) the descriptive format is used because describing some aspect of a job is easier than trying to describe internal feelings (48).

The JDI is a highly satisfactory method of job satisfaction measurement, and has been widely used by researchers. Schwab (46) used the JDI in his study of pay satisfaction in 1974. Shapiro and Stern (47) used it in their study of professional and nonprofessional workers. Miniter (33) used it in his study of librarians. Gordon and Arvey (15) used the JDI plus a demographic questionnaire, a company questionnaire, and five open-ended questions when studying the relationship between education and satisfaction with job content. Vroom describes the JDI as "without a doubt the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction in existence today" (52). In the introduction to Smith's book, Porter calls the JDI
"an eminently usable and practical instrument for measuring satisfaction" (48, p. v). Ronan refers to the Cornell studies that developed the JDI as "the most comprehensive research effort concerned with the problems of job satisfaction measurement" (43, p. 18).

Job Satisfaction Variables

Age.--The majority of studies measuring age and job satisfaction found that older people are generally more satisfied with their jobs than younger people. A study by Herzberg (22), measuring age and job satisfaction, showed a U-shaped curve indicating that morale starts off high, declines until the late 20's, and then rises again for the remainder of the work years. Saleh and Otis (44) studied managers and found that their job satisfaction increased up to age 60 and then declined. Other studies have indicated a greater satisfaction level in older people to be related to adjustment with life situations in general (4).

The study of buyers by Rachman and Kemp (42) found that age correlated positively with job satisfaction, with the oldest category being the most satisfied group. Marconi (32) reports the general consensus of researchers to be that the percentage of highly satisfied workers increases with increased age. Hunt and Saul found the correlation between age and over-all job satisfaction to be greatest among workers who had held the job for less than twelve months. The
authors theorize that realistic work expectations is possibly the explanation for this (24). Hulin and Smith report that "age and tenure seem to be positively related to job satisfaction" (23, p. 88). Glenn, et al. (14) cites three recent national sample surveys (General Social Survey of 1972, 1973, and 1974) which revealed a moderate but consistent positive correlation between age and job satisfaction.

Marital status and parental status.--Carroll (4) found that in general, married workers and those with two or more children were more satisfied with their job than those with one or no children. Rachman and Kemp (42) found that retail buyers that were married were the most satisfied group. Inlow (25) found statistically different results between married and single groups, but no differences in child/no child status, when studying college students in 1950. Wild and Dawson (55) found that both age and marital status had a significant effect on one's perception of or attitude toward, their job. They found that length of service affected job attitudes as well.

Tenure.--Tenure or length of service with a company seems to correlate with higher job satisfaction. Faris (10) reported overall satisfaction to be lowest for those newest in their jobs. Rachman and Kemp (42), in their study of buyers, found greater satisfaction correlated positively with longer tenure. Form and Geschwender (12), as well as
Alderfer (1), found similar results in their studies. However, Gabbert's research (13) indicated that the lowest satisfaction level was observed in the highest tenure group of salesmen. Other factors may have contributed since this group also had the highest educational level and the highest grades in school.

Tenure according to career stages or types was the basis of a study by Van Maanen and Katz. Subjects in the administrative group showed increased satisfaction with increased tenure, but the professional group did not show an increase in job satisfaction relative to increased tenure. Clerical jobs showed a marked increase in satisfaction with increased tenure up to twenty years; after that a decline occurred (50).

Herzberg found the same U-shaped curve related to tenure as it did to age. He explains that job satisfaction was high during the first year of work, then it declined for a number of years, and later increased. He relates this to the idea that initially high work expectations were not fulfilled so satisfaction dropped until realistic expectations developed that allowed greater satisfaction levels (22).

The general trend of the research indicates that greater tenure produces greater satisfaction with a job. Farrell (11) suggests that tenure is an important variable due to the tendency to identify or be positively oriented toward social situations in which one is involved.
Salary.--Inlow (25) found the factor of salary to be closely related to job satisfaction, producing a positive linear relationship. In their study, Rachman and Kemp (42) found a positive relationship between salary and job satisfaction, as did Lawler (29). Schwab (46) measured pay satisfaction through the use of two measurement devices: the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Cornell Job Descriptive Index. Both measures indicated pay level to have a high correlation with pay satisfaction. Also, females were found to be significantly more satisfied with their pay than males on both scales.

Weaver's study (54) supports the theory that higher salary levels produce higher job satisfaction scores. Scanlan (45) held that wages influence job satisfaction, especially in situations where wage increases are based on performance.

While most studies show a positive relationship between wages and satisfaction, pay is not rated as highly as intrinsic job factors. Marconi's report on a study by Vroom and Jencks indicated that workers often tend to compare their pay with wages in similar occupations in other companies. This would tend to indicate that the amount of salary received is not as valid as the relation of that amount to what other workers earn who do similar work (32).

Lawler (29) suggested that pay satisfaction is perceived in the workers' eyes in view of the level of pay they believe
is due to them in relation to their job performance. Gruneberg (19) noted that others have found pay by time more satisfactory than pay by performance. Klein and Maher (26) determined college educated managers to be less satisfied with pay compared to a non-college group, presumably because of the reference groups each related to.

Another factor related to satisfaction with pay is the amount of non-monetary rewards associated with jobs. Satisfaction with non-monetary rewards is closely related to satisfaction with the amount of pay received. Research by Monczka, et al., supported this viewpoint. The total reward system of a company affects an employee's attitude toward satisfaction with pay (34).

Relating sex differences to pay level satisfaction, a 1973 study by Levitin, Quinn, and Staines found that the average woman earned $4,372 less annually than the average man. Ninety-five per cent of women earned less than they should have on an achievement basis, but only 8 per cent said they felt discriminated against. The authors pose the question of whether they were not aware of what salaries men were making or if they only compared themselves to other women and not to men. The following groups were found to experience the greatest amount of discrimination:

(a) ages 16-29 (youngest) and over age 55 (oldest)
(b) white collar more than blue collar
(c) employed in small companies (less than 500 employees)
(d) work in professional, technical, managerial, clerical or sales positions (30).

Lawler (29) claimed that pay is significantly less important to women than to men, even for female household heads. Shapiro and Stern (47) found professional men to be more satisfied with their pay than professional women while non-professional women show more satisfaction with pay than non-professional men.

Ellsworth and Hulquist (8) studied college graduates' reasons for leaving retailing and denoted low salary to be the most common complaint. Duncan (7) verifies this in his 1977 book. Greene (18) found $600 a month to be the average beginning salary in retailing in 1969, with only 1.8 per cent of the women and 19.7 per cent of the males earning over $10,000 a year. The College Placement Council (6) reported that in 1974/75 merchandising and related fields offered about 15 per cent less than the all-industry average. The Career Planning and Placement Office at North Texas State University (35) found $820 to be the mean starting salary in retailing for their graduates in 1978. The figure for 1979 was $932. For graduates in clothing and textiles at North Texas State University, $800 was the average starting salary in 1978; $900 was the average in 1979. The College Placement Council Salary Survey for 1978/79 (5) found approximately $950 to be the average monthly beginning salary offers to graduates employed in merchandising and retailing fields.
nationwide. According to this report, women received lower salary offers than men in all areas except for engineering and accounting.

**Education.**—In 1955, Vollmer and Kinney (51) found that higher education correlated negatively to satisfaction with jobs. Quinn (40) conducted a study which concluded that persons with college degrees were consistently more satisfied with their jobs than were other workers. England and Stein (9) found that greater satisfaction levels correlated positively with higher educational levels in their study. The evidence indicates that job satisfaction is a highly complex subject, involving factors difficult to isolate and identify.

Gordon and Arvey studied the relationship between education and job content and found no significant correlation. However, they discovered that the higher education levels indicated less satisfaction with the way the organization was run (15).

A study of college graduates in 1977 found nearly six out of ten respondents were very satisfied with their jobs, and only 4 per cent were not at all satisfied. Graduates in high-level jobs viewed their jobs as more satisfactory than nonprofessionals viewed theirs. The relationship of the job to college major showed no trend toward level of satisfaction (36).
Sex.-- Hulin and Smith observed females to be less satisfied with their jobs than males. Their study demonstrated that higher job levels and pay scales generally contribute to higher satisfaction and the disadvantages women suffer on the job in the form of lower pay scales, types of work, promotion opportunities, etc., may well be reflected in lower job satisfaction. Hulin and Smith contend that, based on wages and job levels, women should be less satisfied than men since they often have lower level jobs and lower pay rates. Also, occasionally, married women face some role conflict, which can affect job satisfaction. The researchers further report,

Firstly, we do not maintain that sex per se is the crucial factor that leads to either high or low satisfaction ... It is, rather, the entire constellation of variables which consistently co-vary with sex; for example: pay, job level, promotion opportunities, societal norms, etc., that is likely causing the differences in job satisfaction ... It is also likely that if these variables were held constant or if their effects were partialled out, the differences in job satisfaction would have disappeared (23, p. 91).

Shapiro and Stern definitely indicated that nonprofessional women rated their jobs appreciably higher than their male counterpart. But, the highest satisfaction rating was found in the professional male segment, rating much higher than all other groups. Professional females were the second most satisfied segment (47).

Smith, et al., (48) report that with a comparable level of income, women indicate greater job satisfaction than men.
Rachman and Kemp's (42) study of buyers also found females to be more satisfied with their jobs than males. However, Weaver's study (54), done in 1977, showed no statistical significance between the mean scores of males and females.

**General satisfaction with life.**—There is some evidence that general satisfaction with life has an effect on job satisfaction, and vice versa. Job behavior cannot be totally separated from human behavior; they are interrelated. According to Graham,

There appears to be a relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with life in general. A person who is unhappy with life may generalize this attitude to include dissatisfaction with his job, but there is some evidence that job satisfaction is at least partly responsible for satisfaction with life. . . . Satisfaction is a totality concept representing a state of mind. That is, an individual's satisfaction is determined by his total situation at work, home, play, and in all other aspects of his life (45, p. 544).

A study by Handyside and Speak (21) found job satisfaction and satisfaction with life to be separate, independent phenomena. Brayfield, et al., (3) did a study in which general satisfaction and job satisfaction were related for males but not for females. The group concluded that this was due to the higher job level classification of the males, since the females tended to hold only routine clerical positions. The implication is that general satisfaction is only related to job satisfaction when the job is perceived as important in the total life scheme of the individual.
People who view their job as important to their total life scheme must have certain needs gratified through that occupation if they are to find it satisfying. Kuhlen (28) indicates that occupationally-relevant needs must be satisfied if job satisfaction is to be found for an individual. He further points out that there is frequently a conflict between the type of person needed for a job and the potential of that job to satisfy the fundamental career needs of that individual.

Prestige and job level.--According to MacEachron, "hierarchical job level is of interest because it references a cluster of interrelated job characteristics that have a positive impact on job satisfaction" (31, p. 226). Closely related to these job characteristics is the prestige, or perceived prestige, of a job level. MacEachron's study did not show a direct relation between job level and satisfaction for the female group sampled. The sampling technique may have weakened the results since many studies on men have shown a significant relationship (31).

Herzberg's (22) theory of intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction suggests that high-level or intrinsic needs relate to the job itself and bring job satisfaction if these needs are met through the actual work. He separates these from extrinsic factors of the job such as pay, supervision, and general working conditions. His theory is that
these factors can cause dissatisfaction but cannot, of themselves, bring satisfaction on a job. According to Gruneberg (19), some researchers express the view that intrinsic values are more closely related to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction than extrinsic factors. Extrinsic factors are generally easier to measure than intrinsic factors.

England and Stein (9) suggest that job satisfaction varies with occupational level. According to Szilagi (49), this factor cannot be separated from how a person views his occupational level and the prestige involved with that level. An employee's perception of his role seems to greatly affect his probability of experiencing stress, becoming dissatisfied, and performing less effectively. Szilagyi believes organizational level differences to be a possible reason for discrepancies in job satisfaction study results.

Farrell found occupational prestige to be the strongest contributing factor of job satisfaction partly because status or prestige subsumes other factors such as level of skill, level of supervision, level of responsibility, and level of salary. These factors often produce a more desirable job situation. If combined with satisfaction of intrinsic needs, satisfaction with the job would seem more likely (11).

Gray and Levin (17) asked subjects to rate occupation desirability in two different tasks: (1) ratings based on varying levels of salary, work load, and prestige for unidentified occupations; (2) ratings of actual job titles.
Prestige was found to be much more important in rating actual occupations than in rating unidentified occupations. This supports the idea of "perceived" job status as possibly differing from actual job status. Farrell quoted Galenson and Lipset as saying, "When a scale of relative job satisfaction is formed, based on general occupational groupings, the resulting rank order is almost identical with the most commonly used occupational status classification" (11, p. 341).

**Size of Organization.**—Smith, et al. (48) state that company size has been considered an important variable in relation to job satisfaction. However, the relationship between organization size and job satisfaction appears to be unclear and sometimes contradictory. Kovach (27) studied certain variables in relation to organization size. He found greater job satisfaction in smaller organizations mostly because of social and task satisfaction. Economic satisfaction was higher in smaller firms also. The study results indicated, however, that turnover was lower in large organizations due to job security and benefits.

Rachman and Kemp (42) reported retail buyers to be more satisfied with large organizations than with small ones. Beer (2) found an inverse relationship between organization size and satisfaction. He cites a number of other studies which support his results. The same relationship seems to exist for work groups within the organization as well.
Porter studied the size of the work group as well as the size of the organization. He reports,

Increasing the size of the total organization and thereby achieving the technical advantage of large scale organizations, will not necessarily tend to reduce the job satisfaction and morale of employees, as long as intra-organizational units are kept small (38, p. 394).

Another study by Porter (39) suggests that there is a point in an organizational hierarchy (somewhere in middle management) where the disadvantages of working for a large organization are outweighed by the advantages.


CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

Due to the size of the population, geographic distributions, and time factors, the basic procedure of this study involved a mailed questionnaire. The following section includes a description of the chosen population, the administration and description of the instrument, and the method of data analysis used for this research.

Population Selection

Criteria were established for choosing a population, to assure that the group was sufficiently homogeneous for comparison. The graduation dates chosen for this study were determined by the following factors:

1. A reasonable time period in which to include graduates that would allow for similar experiences in employment opportunities and job situations.

2. The lack of available records before 1969.

3. The limited number of clothing and textiles graduates before 1969.

The decision to include all of the clothing and textiles graduates, not just the students in merchandising, stemmed from the lack of option breakdown before 1973, and because of the overlap in course requirements for the various options,
which creates a fashion industry emphasis for all the clothing and textiles majors. Overlap in program requirements, overlap in interest specialization, and a degree of overlap in employment opportunities provided a clear directive towards the inclusion of all clothing and textiles majors in the proposed study. The population of this study includes all North Texas State University clothing and textiles majors who graduated between January, 1969 and August, 1978.

Data Collection Method

A general questionnaire was used to obtain data on the variables related to demographics and employment status. This questionnaire was developed by the researcher to obtain job-related information as well as descriptive demographic data. Job satisfaction was measured by the use of the Job Descriptive Index. Both of these instruments can be found in the Appendix.

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is the result of an intensive program of research conducted at Cornell University by Smith and associates. Extensive study and testing was done to determine the validity of the JDI. Further discussion of this instrument can be found in Chapter II of this study. Because of its high credibility and simplicity of form, this research utilized the JDI as a satisfactory measure of job satisfaction.
The JDI measures five areas of job satisfaction by the use of lists of adjectives and phrases which the respondent was instructed to mark with a Y (yes), N (no), or ? (does not apply), according to its applicability to his or her particular job. The JDI provides scores on the five specific areas of job satisfaction, and an unweighted average was obtained to measure the overall satisfaction level. The five areas measured were pay, work on the present job, opportunities for promotion, supervision received, and co-workers or people connected with the job. The items listed on the JDI were scored as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes to a positive item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No to a negative item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>? to any item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes to a negative item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No to a positive item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1, p. 79)

Extensive testing was done by the Cornell University group to determine which items received which scores. The maximum score possible for any one category is fifty-four. A list of the questions with the "correct" or "satisfied" response filled in, can be found in the Appendix.

The JDI was obtained from the original publication of its development (1). The procedure for measurement was obtained from the same source. Permission to use the JDI was obtained from the senior author.

Administration of Instrument

The research data were obtained by the use of two questionnaires, a general one and the Job Descriptive Index.
Questionnaires were mailed to the permanent address of each graduate. Names and addresses were obtained from the office of the School of Home Economics at North Texas State University and from the University Alumni Office. Each mailing included a cover letter, the two questionnaires, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. The envelopes were coded in order to obtain a record of returns. Telephone calls were made to all the local graduates preceding the initial mailing to obtain address corrections and seek co-operation in completion of the questionnaires. Information on other graduates was requested from each person contacted. Three weeks later a follow-up was made on each graduate who had not returned the questionnaire. A second phone call was made to each local graduate who had not yet responded, and a second questionnaire was mailed to the other non-respondents.

Two hundred and ten questionnaires were mailed out. A total of 123 questionnaires was returned, and all were useable for analysis. This provided a return rate of 58.6 per cent. The returned questionnaires were classified into three groups: (1) not-employed, (2) employed in a field related to college major, and (3) employed in a field unrelated to college major. For the not-employed group, only the information on the first six questions of the general questionnaire was utilized for analysis. This information was compiled by the researcher. Data on the employed group were analyzed by computer.
Data Analysis

Computer analysis was used to set up frequency distributions, determine percentages, and test for levels of significance. A t-test was run on each hypothesis relating job satisfaction to a two-factor variable (hypotheses one, three, and four). For the hypothesis relating job satisfaction to multi-factor variables, a one-way analysis of variance with multiple comparisons was used (hypotheses two, five, six, and seven). Employment status was tested in hypothesis number eight. Contingency tables were used to show the differences in results for graduates employed in related fields and those in unrelated fields on each of six variables (age, marital status, parental status, salary, tenure, and organization size). Chi-square analysis was used to determine if significant differences existed in these variables according to employment status. For all the statistical tests used, the .05 level was used to determine if significant differences existed between the variables being measured.

The Job Descriptive Index provided the scores used to measure job satisfaction. Questions one, two, three, nine, eleven, and twelve of the general questionnaire provided the data on six variables tested in the hypotheses (age, marital status, parental status, salary level, tenure, organization size). Information obtained from questions four, five, seven, thirteen, and seventeen were used for descriptive purposes.
only. These questions concerned ages of children, college graduation dates, hours worked per week, number of jobs held since graduation, and reasons for being employed in an unrelated job. Questions six, eight, ten, and sixteen were job description questions used to classify respondents by job status into three groups: (1) not-employed, (2) employed in fields related to college major, and (3) employed in fields unrelated to college major. For the not-employed group, only the information on the first six questions plus question twelve of the general questionnaire was utilized. This information was compiled by the researcher. Questions fourteen and fifteen, concerning job relatedness, were rejected due to the numerous discrepancies in the responses. Instead, the researcher determined job status relatedness by reference to questions ten and sixteen.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purposes of this study were to determine the employment status of the clothing and textile graduates of North Texas State University from 1969 to 1978 and to measure their job satisfaction level through the use of a standardized index. The data were gathered through the use of a general questionnaire constructed by the researcher and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), a job satisfaction index developed at Cornell University. These instruments were mailed to each qualified graduate, and a follow-up was made to obtain a maximum return rate. The general questionnaire was designed to obtain demographic information as well as employment data. The JDI was used to measure five areas of job satisfaction, and unweighted average of the five scores was used to estimate the over-all job satisfaction level. The data obtained from the questionnaires were analyzed by computer. A t-test was used for each hypothesis relating job satisfaction to a two factor variable, and a one-way analysis of variance was used for each hypothesis relating job satisfaction to a multi-factor variable. Chi-square analysis was used to test the relationship between employment status and six variables. Descriptive data were presented along with the statistical
data. In testing for significance, the .05 level was considered significant in all the statistical tests used.

Description of Population

The population chosen for this research study included all the clothing and textiles graduates of North Texas State University from January, 1969 through August, 1978. The total number of questionnaires mailed out was 210. One hundred twenty-three of these were returned, providing a return rate of 58.6 per cent. The respondents were then classified into one of three groups, according to their job status. Eighty-three (67 per cent) were classified as employed in a field related to their college major. Twenty-eight (23 per cent) were classified as employed in a field unrelated to their college major. The other twelve (10 per cent) were classed as not-employed. The questionnaires for the latter group were not included in the computer analysis since only parts of the general questionnaire were applicable. Only descriptive data are presented for this group. The employed graduates' responses were evaluated by computer.

Not-Employed Group

Only twelve respondents were not employed outside the home. Of these respondents, eleven (92 per cent) were between the ages of 25-34; one was in the 18-24 category. Eleven (92 per cent) were married. Three (25 per cent) of the respondents in this group did not have children. None had children
who were older than elementary school age. Graduation dates were fairly evenly distributed between 1969 and 1978. Ten (83 per cent) of the not-employed group reported having held at least one job since graduation, although they were not presently employed.

The researcher believes that the small number of not-employed graduates may not be truly representative of the population. Due to the employment emphasis of the questionnaires, it is feasible that some of the not-employed graduates felt that they need not respond. As one respondent put it, "I felt your questionnaire was aimed at 'career women outside the home.'" If other graduates felt this way, the number of not-employed graduates may be larger than the responses indicate.

Employed Group

The 111 employed respondents were classified for analysis as employed in a field related to their college major or employed in a field unrelated to their college major. Placement into these classifications was done at the discretion of the researcher, due to discrepancies in responses on some of the questionnaires. Some respondents considered a job unrelated, while others considered the same or similar job as related. To avoid contradiction, the researcher made the distinction of relatedness according to the description and title of the job, rather than on the respondent's opinion of a job's relatedness to her major field.
Demographic Variables

General demographics.--Respondents were asked to indicate their age range. Sixty-four graduates (58 per cent) were between the ages of 25 and 34. Forty-six respondents (41 per cent) were in the 18-24 age bracket. Only one was between 35 and 49, and none were over age 49.

Sixty-seven of the respondents were single (60 per cent), and forty-four (40 per cent) were married. Only one of the single respondents had children; she reported being divorced with one child. Of the married group, only sixteen (14 per cent) had children living at home. Ninety-five (86 per cent) did not have children. Of the 14 per cent who had children, ten (9 per cent) had infants or preschoolers. Only six (5 per cent) had children who were school age.

The respondents were asked to indicate the year they graduated from college. The majority of the graduates who responded to the survey had graduated since 1975. Eighty-five (69.2 per cent) graduated between 1975 and 1978. This high concentration in the last four years was evident only for the employed graduates. The graduation dates of the respondents who were not-employed were more evenly distributed throughout the range of dates. A complete schedule of the distribution of the graduation dates of the respondents is given in Table I.
TABLE I

COLLEGE GRADUATION DATES OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Graduation</th>
<th>Employed Group</th>
<th>Not-Employed Group</th>
<th>Total Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job related demographics.--The majority (111) of the respondents were employed outside the home. Eighty-three (75 per cent) of these were employed in a job related to their college major and twenty-eight (25 per cent) were employed in a job unrelated to their college major.

A question included on the questionnaire was, "What type of organization do you work for?" Six options were listed, including "other." Almost half (46 per cent) of the
respondents were employed by a retail store. Eleven (10 per cent) were employed by an apparel manufacturer. One reported employment in a resident buying office and two listed interior design studio. Forty-six respondents (41 per cent) listed an organization in the "other" classification. The list of organizations covered by "other" was quite lengthy, with only a few being listed more than once. Organizations listed more than once included bank (4 times), airline company (4), medical profession (3), oil company (3), law firm (2), insurance company (2), county extension agency (2), educational system (7). The other responses covered a wide range of organization types typical of employment opportunities open to most anyone.

Job relatedness is somewhat determined by organization type but is not restricted to certain types. Rather, the type of position held within the company is the main determinant of job relatedness. The diversity of the job positions is an example of the diversity of the clothing and textiles major. Management and management related jobs were the most prevalent type with 38 per cent (41 respondents) employed in this type of job (including store owner). Buying and related positions were held by 15 per cent of the respondents. Table II demonstrates the wide range of positions held by the respondents. Distinction is made as to the relatedness of the job to college major.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related Jobs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Buyer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Trainee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel Designer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Designer/Pattern Maker/Pattern Grader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Owner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Designer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Agent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrelated Jobs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper/Secretary/Receptionist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Attendant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Teller</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Employee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Care Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartographic Aid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The graduates were asked to indicate the salary they are currently receiving. Table III presents data on the salary levels of the respondents. The salary levels approximate a normal curve which is positively skewed.

**TABLE III**

**ANNUAL SALARY LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $8,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 - $12,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13,000 - $16,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17,000 - $20,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,000 - $29,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 or over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than three-fourths of the respondents earn $12,000 or less per year. The largest group (44 per cent) earn salaries of $9,000 to $12,000 a year. The second largest group (31 per cent) earn salaries of only $5,000 to $8,000 a year. The job satisfaction scores for pay give some indication as to how satisfied these workers are with these salaries. Satisfaction with pay was the lowest for all groups.
Tenure was another factor included in this research. The number of respondents who have worked at their present job for less than one year was forty-two or 38 per cent. Tenure of one to two years was indicated by 36 per cent. Twenty-five (23 per cent) have been at their job for three to five years, and only four (4 per cent) have obtained tenure of six to nine years. The low levels of tenure could be indicative of high turnover rates, which is characteristic of retailing. They could also account for the low salary levels, since salary increases are often related to tenure.

The respondents were asked to indicate the size of the organization in which they are employed. Seventy-two (65 per cent) of the respondents are employed by organizations which have over 100 employees. Twenty-six (23 per cent) are employed in organizations having under 25 employees, and thirteen (12 per cent) are employed by organizations which have between 25 and 100 employees.

A question concerning hours worked per week was included on the questionnaire. An average of 21 to 45 hours per week was reported by eighty (72 per cent) of the respondents. One-fourth (twenty-eight) of the respondents indicated a schedule of over 45 hours a week. Only three respondents (3 per cent) work less than 20 hours a week. This group would be considered in part-time employment.

Most of the respondents (59 per cent) indicated having worked at more than one job since graduation. Opinions on
the relatedness of these jobs to college major were requested but rejected due to discrepancies by respondents in judging a job as related or not. Forty-five respondents (41 per cent) have held only one job since graduation, but over half (51 per cent) have held two or three jobs since graduation. Thirty-six (32 per cent) have held two jobs, twenty-one (19 per cent) indicated three jobs, seven (6 per cent) indicated four jobs, and two (2 per cent) indicated having held five jobs since graduation from college. These figures indicate a rather high turnover rate since most respondents have graduated since 1975. This is also a possible explanation for low salary and tenure levels. A high turnover rate is characteristic of the retailing field.

Respondents employed in fields unrelated to their college major were asked to give reasons for choosing employment in these unrelated fields. The number one reason given was low salaries. The second most frequent reason given was "found something I liked better." This was followed by inability to find a job related to their college major. Many of the respondents gave more than one answer to this question. The responses are listed in Table IV showing frequencies and percentage of response.

The fact that "chose another field" was indicated instead of "found something I liked better" indicates that for these respondents, the choice of another field was made for reasons other than disliking a related job.
TABLE IV

REASONS GIVEN BY RESPONDENTS FOR NOT BEING EMPLOYED IN A FIELD RELATED TO THEIR COLLEGE MAJOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency*</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available jobs didn't pay enough</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found something I liked better</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't find one</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to locate where jobs are</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't like type of work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job was too demanding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chose another field</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took first job offered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours objectionable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited advancement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned to college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were given.

Five respondents indicated a dislike of the type of work, while another twenty-five listed other job-related elements such as objectionable hours, limited advancement, job too demanding, and poor pay.

Job Satisfaction

A major objective of this research study was to provide a measurement of the level of job satisfaction experienced
by the clothing and textiles graduates surveyed. The Job Descriptive Index was used to obtain this measurement. The JDI measured five areas of job satisfaction, and a separate score was obtained for each. These five scores were averaged to obtain a general satisfaction score for each respondent. The mean scores were charted in Table V for those employed in a related field compared with those employed in an unrelated field. The five scores represent the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction which the respondents experienced in certain aspects of their job. These were satisfaction with the work itself, the pay received, opportunities for promotion, supervision received, and the people one associates with on the job. The highest possible score for any one factor was fifty-four. The scores must be judged in relation to the other scores in the same study; no particular numerical value indicated satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

**TABLE V**

MEAN SCORES ON THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX ACCORDING TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
<th>Score Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related Job (N=83)</td>
<td>36.52</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>33.43</td>
<td>45.04</td>
<td>42.13</td>
<td>36.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Job (N=28)</td>
<td>36.93</td>
<td>33.93</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>38.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group (N=111)</td>
<td>36.62</td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>44.85</td>
<td>42.54</td>
<td>37.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V indicated that the total group of respondents was most satisfied with the type of supervision received on the job. This was true for both related and unrelated jobs. The other area in which satisfaction was high was with co-workers or people associated with on the job. For respondents employed in related jobs, the lowest level of satisfaction was indicated in the area of pay received. The pay score was also the lowest recorded for the total group. Respondents in unrelated jobs were not as dissatisfied with pay as with promotion potential. These factors point to some interesting possibilities: (1) pay may be a major reason for selection of employment in an unrelated field, and (2) the types of jobs held by those in unrelated fields may not be as promotion-oriented as those held by respondents in related fields. Workers in unrelated jobs indicated lowest satisfaction levels in the area of promotion. This factor received the second lowest score for the total group. The scores for work itself were very similar for both groups and were very close to the average mean scores.

The average scores, indicating over-all job satisfaction, obtained from JDI were used to test for significant differences in job satisfaction scores according to selected job related variables. A t-test or one-way analysis of variance was used to test for differences in job satisfaction scores according to job status, age, marital status, parental status, salary, tenure, and organization size. The .05
level was considered significant for all statistical tests used in this study.

As shown in Table V, the mean score for those employed in related fields was 36.87. The mean score for those in an unrelated job was 38.07. A t-test produced a t-value of -0.65 (df=109) which indicated no significant difference between the two scores (hypothesis one).

Age range was one variable tested for a possible relationship to job satisfaction (hypothesis two). The group in the age range 18 to 24 had a mean job satisfaction score of 37.91. The 25 to 34 year old group had a mean score of 36.67. The oldest group, those between age 35 and 49, had a mean score of 35.00. Using a one-way analysis of variance produced an F ratio of 0.32 (df=2,108). No significant difference was found in job satisfaction scores for the various age ranges studied. There is demonstrated, however, a negative correlation between age and job satisfaction.

Marital status was identified to determine its relationship to job satisfaction (hypothesis three). The married respondents had a mean score of 35.73, and the single respondents had a mean score of 38.15. A t-test produced a t-value of -1.49 (df=109) which indicated no significant difference between married and single graduates' scores.

Presence or absence of children in the home was another variable tested for possible relationship to job satisfaction (hypothesis four). Respondents with children at home had a
mean job satisfaction score of 35.13; those without children at home had a mean score of 37.52. Using a t-test produced a t-value of -1.05 (df=109) which indicated no significant difference between the scores for the two groups.

Using one-way analysis of variance, the mean job satisfaction scores were compared with the size of the organization in which respondents were employed (hypothesis seven). The test produced an F ratio of 0.619 (df=2,108). For those respondents employed in an organization having fewer than 25 employees, the group mean score was 35.62. For those in organizations employing 25 to 100 employees, the group mean score was 37.00. For those respondents employed in organizations of over 100 employees, the group mean score was 37.76. The scores were positively correlated with organization size even though the differences between scores were not found to be significant.

Since salary level has been shown to be related to job satisfaction in past research, mean job satisfaction scores for each salary level were compared to determine if any significant difference existed between salary level and job satisfaction for this population (hypothesis five). Table VI shows a schedule of the mean JDI scores for each salary level. With the exception of the $13,000 - $16,000 range, greater satisfaction would be positively correlated with salary level. However, using one-way analysis of variance, no significant difference was found between the scores.
TABLE VI
MEAN SCORES ON THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX
ACCORDING TO ANNUAL SALARY LEVEL

Salary Level Group Mean
Under $5,000 30.33
$5,000 - $8,000 35.74
$9,000 - $12,000 36.51
$13,000 - $16,000 41.57
$17,000 - $20,000 41.00
$21,000 - $29,000 41.00
$30,000 or over 46.00

F ratio = 1.486; df = 6,102.

Table VII shows the mean job satisfaction scores for
the various tenure levels of the respondents (hypothesis six). The greatest satisfaction is indicated by the group with the
most tenure. This is followed by the group with the lowest
tenure. This corresponds with Herzberg's U-shaped curve, in-
dicating satisfaction was high at the beginning, dropping in
the intermediate years, and rising again in the latter years.
It is shown, using one-way analysis of variance, that no
significant difference is evident between the scores for
different levels of tenure.

TABLE VII
MEAN SCORES ON THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX
ACCORDING TO TENURE

Tenure Level Group Mean
Less than 1 year 37.88
1 - 2 years 36.78
3 - 5 years 36.00
6 - 9 years 41.00

F ratio = 0.557; df = 3,107.
Relationship Between Employment Status
and Selected Variables

One objective of this study (hypothesis eight) was to explore the possibility that graduates who work in fields related to their college major vary significantly in certain factors from graduates who are employed in fields unrelated to their college major. To test this hypothesis, chi-square analysis was used to determine any significant differences in age, marital status, parental status, tenure, salary, or size of the employer organization for graduates employed in a related field as opposed to those in an unrelated field. For each test, the .05 level was considered to be significant.

Table VIII shows a breakdown by age group for the two types of employment status. For graduates employed in

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF AGE RANGE IN RELATION TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>35 - 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Job (N=38)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Job (N=28)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group (N=111)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.07 < 2 \text{df}; \quad P = 0.22. \]
unrelated jobs, a much larger percentage were over age twenty-five than under. This could be because graduates held related jobs after graduation but later became dis- satisfied and switched to an unrelated job. No significant difference was found between age range and employment status.

The relationship between marital status and job status was tested using chi-square analysis and no significant difference was found between marital status and job status. Table IX shows the marital status of the respondents according to employment status. Both frequencies and percentages are given. There were more single than married graduates for both types of employment status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE IX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPARISON OF MARITAL STATUS IN RELATION TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Job (N=83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Job (N=28)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group (N=111)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 0.14 \leq 1 \text{df}; \quad P = 0.7. \]
Chi-square analysis revealed no significant difference in parental status according to employment type. The results of the survey are charted in Table X. A large majority of the respondents did not have children at home. This was true for both types of job status.

TABLE X

COMPARISON OF PARENTAL STATUS IN RELATION TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Parental Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children in the Home</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Children in the Home</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Job (N=83)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Job (N=28)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group (N=111)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.83 \text{ with } 1 \text{ df}; \quad P = 0.36. \]

Chi-square analysis was used to test the relationship between employment status and organization size. The majority of the respondents in both types of job status were employed in large organizations. However, no significant differences were found between organization size and employment status. More complete data on organization size and employment status are found in Table XI.
TABLE XI
COMPARISON OF ORGANIZATION SIZE IN RELATION TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Organization Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 25 Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Job (N=83)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Job (N=28)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group (N=111)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.37 \text{ with } 2 \text{ df; } P = 0.3 \]

The relationship between tenure and job status was tested using chi-square analysis. Table XII shows the results.

TABLE XII
COMPARISON OF TENURE IN RELATION TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Tenure Level</th>
<th>Less Than 1 Year</th>
<th>1-2 Years</th>
<th>3-5 Years</th>
<th>6-9 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Job (N=83)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Job (N=28)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group (N=111)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.43 \text{ with } 3 \text{ df; } P = 0.93 \]
For the different levels of tenure, there is a negative correlation shown for the total group. However, no significant difference was found between job status and tenure for the respondents of this study.

Table XIII shows a breakdown by salary level. Chi-square analysis revealed no significant difference between the various salary levels and employment status.
TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF SALARY LEVEL IN RELATION TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Salary Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>$5,000-$8,000</td>
<td>$9,000-$12,000</td>
<td>$13,000-$16,000</td>
<td>$17,000-$20,000</td>
<td>$21,000-$29,000</td>
<td>$30,000 or Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Job</td>
<td>N=83</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Job</td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>N=111</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.96 \text{ with 7df; } p = 0.66 \]
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this study were to explore the employment status of North Texas State University clothing and textiles majors who graduated between 1969 and 1978 and to provide a measurement of their job satisfaction. The data were collected through the use of a general questionnaire, developed by the researcher, and the Job Descriptive Index, a standardized measure of job satisfaction developed at Cornell University. The JDI was used to measure five areas of job satisfaction and an unweighted average of the five scores was used to estimate over-all job satisfaction level.

Data on the employed respondents were analyzed by computer. Data on the not-employed group were compiled by the researcher. A t-test, a one-way analysis of variance or chi-square was used to test each hypothesis of the study. Contingency tables were used to demonstrate much of the data. Descriptive data were presented as well as the statistical data. For the purposes of this study, a significant difference was identified as a statistical value with a significance level of .05 or less. Data were gathered to test the hypotheses of the study and to identify information concerning the employment status and job satisfaction of the population studied.
A total of 210 questionnaires were mailed out and 123 were returned, producing a return rate of 58.6 per cent. Of the 123 respondents, 90 per cent were employed and 10 per cent were not employed. The employed group was divided according to the relatedness of job to college major. Three-fourths of the employed group were employed in a job related to college major, and the remainder were employed in an unrelated field.

Almost all of the not-employed group were married, were in the 25 to 34 age group, and 75 per cent had children living at home. Eighty-three per cent had held at least one job since graduation even though they were not presently employed.

Ninety-five per cent of the employed respondents were between age 18 and 34. Sixty per cent were single and 40 per cent were married. Ninety-five per cent did not have children. The majority of the graduates who responded to the survey were those who had graduated since 1975. Almost 70 per cent of the respondents graduated between 1975 and 1978.

Regarding types of employer organizations, 46 per cent of the respondents were employed by a retail store. The job positions held by this group included store owner, manager, manager trainee, assistant manager, buyer, assistant buyer, and salesperson. Eleven per cent were employed by an apparel manufacturer. The job positions held by this group were designer, assistant designer, pattern maker, pattern grader,
and sales person. Other jobs classed as related were interior designer, extension agent, and teacher. A wide variety of unrelated jobs and organization types were reported. Bookkeeper/receptionist/secretary, flight attendant, and programmer were the only jobs mentioned more than twice each. The only unrelated organization types mentioned more than twice were bank, airline company, medical profession, and oil company.

Seventy-eight per cent of the respondents earned $12,000 or less per year. The largest group (44 per cent) earned between $9,000 and $12,000 per year. Thirty-one per cent earned between $5,000 and $8,000 per year with only 10 per cent earning more than $12,000.

Concerning tenure, 74 per cent of the respondents had worked at their job for two years or less. Only 4 per cent had tenure of six years or more.

The majority of the respondents (65 per cent) were employed by a large organization, i.e., one employing over 100 employees. Less than a fourth were employed in an organization of fewer than 25 employees. The remaining 12 per cent were employed in organizations employing between 25 and 100 employees.

Almost three-fourths of the respondents worked between 21 and 45 hours per week. Only 25 per cent worked more hours than this per week. The other 3 per cent were considered
part-time workers since they worked less than 20 hours per week.

The major reasons given by respondents for being employed in an unrelated field were low pay, preference for another field, and inability to find a job or to locate where jobs are available. Twenty-five respondents listed job related elements such as objectionable hours, dislike of the type of work, and low salaries.

Mean scores were determined for the five areas of job satisfaction. The total group was most satisfied with the type of supervision received on the job and least satisfied with the pay received. Satisfaction with co-workers ranked second, followed by satisfaction with the work itself. The work score was very close to the average score for all factors. The promotion score ranked in fourth place.

The mean score for over-all job satisfaction revealed that those in unrelated jobs were slightly more satisfied than those in related jobs (38.07 unrelated; 36.87 related). The mean score for the total group fell just below the seventy-fifth percentile, indicating an above average job satisfaction level.

For all hypotheses tested by this study and for all statistical tests used, no significant differences were revealed. However, some observable differences were identified by analysis of frequencies, percentages, and mean scores.
Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the data obtained from this study. The conclusions are limited to this research population and are not intended to describe any other population.

Graduates in clothing and textiles tend to seek and obtain employment related to their major field of study. Seventy-five per cent of the graduates are employed in a field related to college major. Retailing and merchandising jobs are held by more graduates than any other job type.

Graduates in clothing and textiles are generally satisfied with the jobs they presently hold. The scores recorded in this study fall just slightly below the seventy-fifth percentile.

The findings tend to support the conclusion that the population is homogeneous to the extent that significant differences do not exist in factors such as age, marital status, parental status, salary, tenure, organization size, and employment status to produce significant differences in job satisfaction scores. The majority of the respondents to this study are single, have no children, and are between age 18 and 34. They work for a large organization and have been on the job for two years or less. They work in a field related to their college major and earn $12,000 or less per year.
Recommendations

Several recommendations for further research have been identified as a result of this research study.

1. For the benefit of comparison and verification of this study, it is recommended that this study be repeated using the same population but employing a different job satisfaction index to compare results.

2. It is further recommended that this same study be conducted again in five years to compare results and determine changes.

3. Another possibility is to study only those graduates employed in the field of retailing to more closely identify the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction related to this field.

4. A study could be done in which clothing and textiles graduates are surveyed about the adequacy of their college curriculum for career preparation.

5. Based on the low return rate by the not-employed graduates in this study, it is recommended that in a follow-up study some adjustments be made to encourage a higher return rate by those who are not employed in a job outside the home. This could be done through careful wording of the cover letter and by adjusting the questionnaire so that the not-employed group could clearly determine which parts applied to them.
Dear Graduate:

I am a graduate student in Home Economics at North Texas State University doing a thesis research study on the employment status and job satisfaction of past Clothing and Textiles graduates of North Texas State University.

Would you please take a few minutes of your time to fill out the enclosed questionaires and return them to me as soon as possible. I greatly appreciate your co-operation.

A fellow Alumni,

Pamela Boak
Graduate Student

Marian H. Jernigan
Associate Professor
Fashion Merchandising
GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE

If you are not presently employed, but have been within the last 12 months, please check the blank and answer the following questions in regards to the last place of employment in which you worked at least 3 months.

Please answer each question by checking or filling in the blank:

1. What is your age?
   ____ 18-24
   ____ 25-34
   ____ 35-49
   ____ 50 or over

2. What is your marital status?
   ____ married
   ____ single

3. Do you have any children living at home with you?
   ____ yes
   ____ no

4. If yes, what are their age ranges? (indicate number in each group)
   ____ infants or preschoolers
   ____ elementary
   ____ middle school
   ____ high school
   ____ college

5. What year did you graduate from college? __________

6. Are you presently employed in a job outside of your home?
   ____ yes
   ____ no

7. Approximately how many hours per week do you work?
   ____ under 20 hours
   ____ 21-45 hours
   ____ over 45 hours
8. What type of organization do you work for?
   ____ Retail store
   ____ Apparel manufacturer
   ____ Advertising agency
   ____ Resident buying office
   ____ Interior design studio
   ____ Other (please specify) ________________________________

9. What is the approximate size of the organization for which you work?
   ____ under 25 employees
   ____ 25-100 employees
   ____ over 100 employees

10. What position do you hold? Briefly describe your major job duties. ____________________________________________

11. How long have you been employed on your present job or with your present employer?
    ____ less than one year
    ____ 1-2 years
    ____ 3-5 years
    ____ 6-9 years
    ____ 10 or more years

12. What is your approximate annual salary level?
    ____ under $5,000
    ____ $5,000 to $8,000
    ____ $9,000 to $12,000
    ____ $13,000 to $16,000
    ____ $17,000 to $20,000
    ____ $21,000 to $29,000
    ____ $30,000 or over

13. How many jobs have you held since graduation? (Don't count jobs held less than 3 months) _______________________

14. Were any of these related to your major field of study in college? (indicate the number)
    ____ yes
    ____ no

15. Are you presently employed in a job related to your college major?
    ____ yes
    ____ no
16. If you are not employed in a job related to your college major, what type of job are you employed in?

17. If you are not employed in a job related to your college major, why not?
   — couldn't find one
   — available jobs didn't pay enough
   — didn't like the type of work
   — found something I liked better
   — inability to locate where the jobs were
   — hours were too long
   — job was too demanding
   — other (please specify)
THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX

© 1975, Bowling Green State University

Please complete the following using the directions shown:

I. WORK ON PRESENT JOB

Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below, write Y for "YES" if it describes your work, N for "NO" if it does not describe it, ? if you cannot decide.

| Y Fascinating       | Y Useful
| N Routine          | N Tiresome
| Y Satisfying       | Y Healthful
| N Boring           | Y Challenging
| Y Good             | N On your feet
| Y Creative         | N Frustrating
| Y Respected        | N Simple
| N Hot              | N Endless
| Y Pleasant         | Y Gives sense of accomplishment

II. PRESENT PAY

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word put Y if it describes your pay, N if it does not describe it, ? if you cannot decide.

| Y Income adequate for normal expenses | Y Satisfactory profit sharing
| N Barely live on income               | N Income provides luxuries
| N Bad                                 | N Less than I deserve
| Y Highly paid                         | N Underpaid
| N Insecure                           | N Insecure
THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX

Please complete the following using the directions shown:

I. WORK ON PRESENT JOB

Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below, write Y for "YES" if it describes your work, N for "NO" if it does not describe it, ? if you cannot decide.

Y Fascinating  Y Useful
N Routine     N Tiresome
Y Satisfying  Y Healthful
N Boring      Y Challenging
Y Good        N On your feet
Y Creative    N Frustrating
Y Respected   N Simple
N Hot         N Endless
Y Pleasant    Y Gives sense of accomplishment

II. PRESENT PAY

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word put Y if it describes your pay, N if it does not describe it, ? if you cannot decide.

Y Income adequate for normal expenses
Y Satisfactory profit sharing
N Barely live on income
N Bad
Y Income provides luxuries
N Less than I deserve
Y Highly paid
N Underpaid
N Insecure
III. OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you now have. How well does each of the following words describe these? In the blank beside each word put Y for YES if it describes your opportunities for promotion, N for NO if it does not describe them, ? if you cannot decide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good opportunities for promotion</th>
<th>Opportunity somewhat limited</th>
<th>Promotion on ability</th>
<th>Dead-end job</th>
<th>Good chance for promotion</th>
<th>Unfair promotion policy</th>
<th>Infrequent promotions</th>
<th>Regular promotions</th>
<th>Fairly good chance for promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision? In the blank beside each word below, put Y if it describes the supervision you get on your job, N if it does not describe it, ? if you cannot decide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asks my advice</th>
<th>Hard to please</th>
<th>Impolite</th>
<th>Praises good work</th>
<th>Tactful</th>
<th>Influential</th>
<th>Up-to-date</th>
<th>Doesn't supervise enough</th>
<th>Quick tempered</th>
<th>Tells me where I stand</th>
<th>Annoying</th>
<th>Stubborn</th>
<th>Knows job well</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Intelligent</th>
<th>Leaves me on my own</th>
<th>Around when needed</th>
<th>Lazy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
V. PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB

Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? In the blank beside each word below, put Y if it describes these people, N if it does not describe them, ? if you cannot decide.

- Y Stimulating
- N Boring
- N Slow
- Y Ambitious
- N Stupid
- Y Responsible
- Y Fast
- Y Intelligent
- N Easy to make enemies
- N Talk too much
- Y Smart
- N Lazy
- N Unpleasant
- N No privacy
- Y Active
- N Narrow interests
- Y Loyal
- N Hard to meet
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