HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND JOB SATISFACTION: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY

By

RAMONA BRYANT KELLAM

Bachelor of Science in Education
Langston University
Langston, Oklahoma
1973

Master of Science
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, Wisconsin
1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1987

HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES PERCEPTIONS

OF THEIR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

AND JOB SATISFACTION:

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Thesis Approved:

Anna M. Gorman
Thesis Advisor

Elaine Jorgenson

Lettye J. Gaffney

John L. Baird

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

Dedicated to Mrs. Zella J. Black Patterson

A Giant of a Mentor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation represents the contributions of numerous persons whom I now wish to thank. Special thanks and appreciation are extended to members of my doctoral advisory committee. I especially want to thank Dr. Anna Gorman, research advisor for the direction and assistance given toward completion of this research. I sincerely thank Dr. Elaine Jorgenson for her advice and guidance throughout this effort. Gratitude is extended to Dr. Bettye Gaffney for her unwaiving encouragement and steadfast support during this endeavor. And, I extend my unreserved appreciation to Dr. John Baird for his willingness to serve as a member of the research committee. Recognition is given to Dr. William Warde, consulting statistician who assisted with the computer programming and statistical analysis employed to complete this research.

Personal appreciation is extended to my family, friends, and church members for their love, support, encouragement, and prayers. This endeavor would not have been possible without the support of my parents, family members, and friends.

May God richly bless each of you for your assistance in helping me to attain this goal. Thank you very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Home economics originated in America during the latter half of the nineteenth century. It is considered to be an area of study as well as a group of related occupations. As a field of study, home economics integrates principles from all the sciences (physical, biological, behavioral, and social), art, and philosophy into one functional whole for services to individuals and families. Integrating all these areas for improving family and personal living is the unique purpose of home economics (Hoeflin, Pence, Miller, and Weber, 1984).

Compared to other fields such as philosophy, mathematics, and astronomy, home economics is one of the youngest. With a history of less than 100 years, home economics is one of the less visible academic areas, still enduring some of the vicissitudes associated with acquiring the characteristics of a profession. Home economics is viewed as a professional field primarily at the college and university level.

Professional home economists are employed in a variety of professional positions. However, the majority of home economists are teachers. There are approximately 60,000

teaching in secondary and adult program, 7,000 teaching in colleges and universities, and 2,000 teaching in nursery schools or elementary schools. More than 4,000 home economists are working in private business firms and associations, while several thousand are employed in research and social welfare programs. About 500 home economists work as journalists, and some 6,000 are cooperative extension home economists. Growing numbers of men are employed in home economic careers (East, 1980).

In response to the rapid growth of home economics during the 1960s and 1970s, colleges and university programs were producing graduates with home economics majors in record numbers. Home economics at the undergraduate level, in particular, continue to increase in both enrollment and degrees granted (Harper 1975).

In contrast to the tremendous growth that occurred in higher education in general and home economics specifically during the 1960s and 1970s, higher education in the 1980s is experiencing a period of reduction, reallocation, and retrenchment (Mortimer and Tierney, 1979). Gene Budig (1981) had described the 1980s as "A Troubled Decade" as well as a decade of uncertainty. He considers inflation and declining enrollments to be major threats to American colleges and universities. The absence of quality is also believed to be a critical educational issue of the current decade.

During this period of reduction, reallocation, and

retrenchment more and more pressure is being placed on educational institutions and programs for excellence, accountability, and improved planning in the use of scarce resources and a dwindling traditional college age clientele. According to Budig (1981), the 1980s demand that educational leaders be prepared as effective advocates who are able to explain to the citizenry that higher education as served the national well. During this decade, taxpayers have to be persuaded that colleges and universities have done a great deal to make the United States strong, affluent, and informed.

Statement of the Problem

In recent years society has been hit by the devastating impact of inflation and recession. Resources for higher education in the 1980s are scarce in comparison to those of the 1960s and 1970s. In order to effectively handle the current challenges in higher education as well as face the uncertainties of the future, academic leaders need reliable information by which to make rational decisions and long range plans. Educational administrators also need reliable and valid information in order to justify decisions regarding educational program improvement, expansion, deletion, or revision.

The home economics profession is no exception when it comes to being accountable for the use of resources during this period of decline in higher education. Professional

home economists in higher education need valid and reliable data on which to base decisions as they relate to changes in the educational environment. Lee and Van Horn (1983) states that good information is the basis for good decisions.

Generally speaking, the data that are used to assess the quality and effectiveness of an educational program are obtained in a number of ways. For example, quality is often measured according to the number of degrees awarded, test scores of entering and completing students, and the teacher-student ration. Fain (1981) states that

> the Division-wide follow-up survey, could obtain opinions of the home economics graduates concerning their professional preparation programs in relation to their personal and professional development, as well as any recommendations they might have for programmatic changes (pp. 3-4).

By conducting a follow-up study of home economics graduates, one assesses how the graduates differ and how the graduates are alike and thus uses these findings to estimate the educational and professional needs of future professional home economists as well as verify the current state of quality in the program. This study serves as a planning aid for administrators in the college of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University in estimating how to structure and reform educational programs to meet the professional training needs of current and future students.

Purpose and Objectives

The key to the future of home economics is held by colleges and universities. Colleges and universities have the responsibility for developing leadership in the field of home economics. One of the main objectives of higher education in home economics is to prepare students for employment on a professional level (Haley, 1984). The appraisal of an educational program is a continuing need in a world of accelerated change. It is through thoughtful appraisal that the good in a program is retained and changes are made intelligently. As departments study the success and failure of graduates, they are able to determine whether the objectives for students are being achieved and, if the objectives are valid.

Revisions are made in a curriculum when the need for changes becomes evident. The perceptions of graduates toward their preparation for employment and their success on the job are deemed to be effective measures of the quality of their educational preparation (Wise, Hengstatler, and Braskamp, 1981).

The purpose of this research is to conduct a follow-up study of persons who graduated from the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University during the years May, 1980 through December, 1984 in order to ascertain differences in their perceptions of their professional preparation and job satisfaction, in relation to the year of graduation, major, and other selected variables.

Follow-up studies illustrate the extent to which graduates of a particular program are different, or unique, and enable program planners to formulate a program that enhances these differences for maximum use to society. A theory of higher education may be developed from follow-up studies by showing which characteristics of graduates are constant and which are amenable to change.

The following objectives have been formulated for this study.

1. To assess if the major, GPA, year graduated, and current job title are associated with the graduate's perceptions of their professional preparation and their job satisfaction.

2. To assess if the graduates contribution to the profession and professional growth are associated with their perceived professional preparation and job satisfaction.

Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses of this study are as follows.

H_1: There will be no statistically significant differences between the major, GPA, year of graduation, current job title, and the graduate's perceptions of their professional preparation and their job satisfaction.

H_2: Their will be no statistically significant association between the graduate's contribution to the profession, professional growth and their perceived job satisfaction and professional preparation.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions are basic to this study.

1. Follow-up studies are of value to educational institutions, to society, and to educational theory (Gay, 1981).

2. Alumni ratings are used as a source of evaluative information for improving the College of Home Economics undergraduate program (Wise, Hengstatler, and Braskamp, 1981).

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in the following ways.

1. The study is limited by the completeness of the answers obtained on the survey instrument.

2. The data are limited to only the graduates of the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University during the academic years 1980 to 1984.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are used in this study to increase the understanding of the study.

1. Higher education - college or university education. (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975).

2. Home economics - an area of study or a group of related occupations concerned with strengthening family life. (American Home Economics Association, 1975).

3. Perception - the personal meaning that graduates of the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University attach to situations that appear to them.

4. Administrator - a department chairperson or individual of equal status who is responsible for providing direction to a home economics program of study.

5. Graduate - an individual who has received a baccalaureate degree from the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University with a major in one of six identified areas.

6. Job satisfaction - the degree to which graduates are satisfied with their employment situation as identified by the total score for items 1 through

20 of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al, 1967).

7. Professional preparation - the degree to which graduates perceive their educational and occupational experience as identified by scores for items 24 through 37 of the follow-up questionnaire.

8. Professional growth - the extent to which graduates have made a contribution to their chosen profession through various organizational involvements and memberships as identified in Part IV, 38 - 58 of the follow-up questionnaire.

9. Professional Home Economists - One who holds a degree from a college or university with a major in Home Economics (Fain, 1981).

Organization of the Study

Background information pertinent to this study is presented in Chapter I. This chapter also contains the statement of the problem, purpose and objectives, hypotheses, assumptions, limitations, and definition of terms. A review of the related literature is presented in Chapter II, and Chapter III contains the methods and procedures for the study. Chapter IV presents the findings derived from an analysis of the follow-up data. The conclusions reached from the research and the recommendations for future studies are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of literature has been organized into six sections. The first section addresses the history and relevance of home economics as an academic discipline and a field of study. The second section addresses the area of program evaluation higher education. The third section focuses on evaluation models while the fourth section addresses the purpose of accreditation in higher education. The fifth section is a review of home economics accreditation. And, the final section is focused on follow-up studies.

Home Economics

Home economics is considered to be a major factor in the history of the education of women. In fact, the history of home economics parallels the history of education for women (Carer, 1979). Home economics had its origin in America during the nineteenth century. During the seventeenth and eighteenth century grammar schools and college did not allow girls and women to attend. The idea of

coeducation became more familiar to the public through the efforts of such women as Catherine Beecher, Emma Willard, Mary Lyons, Susan B. Anthony, and other pioneer women of the nineteenth century. Under the guidance of the women of this era, who broke the tradition, Oberlin College opened its doors to female students in 1833 and was soon followed by other colleges doing the same (Bevier 1925).

In 1862 the land-grant colleges were established by the passage of the Morrill Act. These colleges were founded by the states in an effort to connect education with the daily life and occupations of the people. The land-grant colleges answered the need for the application of science in solving problems on the farm, in the mines, and in industry. A large number of land-grant colleges were established from 1865 to 1875. Most of the land-grant colleges that were established in the West were open to female students. It was in the land-grant colleges where home economics was first introduced as education designed for women (Branegan, 1929). It was also in the land-grant colleges where the higher education of women in the United States took root and began to grow. Home economics instruction provided in the land-grant institutions was initially directed toward the preparation of women for work in the home.

The training of teachers of home economics consisted largely of one course known as the teacher's course. This coursewas basically a course that provides students with

the opportunity to acquire practical experience in teaching. The teacher's course was the vehicle by which students could have an idea of what some of the problems of teaching and handling elementary and secondary school pupils entails. This course is also designed to teach students to use their hands as well as their minds. Practice lessons are often given by students before classes in which they are members (Harrison, 1925).

One of the major influences in charting the course of home economics and establishing principles in the field was the Lake Placid Conferences. The Lake Placid Conferences were held over a period of 10 years, from 1899 to 1908. Under the direction of Mrs. Ellen H. Richards, these events gave the field of home economics its name and identity. The first conference was composed of 11 individuals who felt strongly about the ability of home economics as an emerging field to help the social situation of the time, and contribute to the nation's welfare. The committees formed in these conferences worked diligently through the years to get the subject into pedagogical form so that it might take a proper place in the educational curriculum (McGrath and Johnson, 1968).

The standards and directions set forth at the Lake Placid Conferences constituted the beginning of professionalism. In December of 1908, The American Home Economics Association (AHEA) was organized as the successor of the Lake Placid Conferences. By 1910, advocates of home econo-

mics had attained an honorable place in the curriculum of many types of education institutions (Bevier, 1925).

By 1939, AHEA had a membership of 15,180. By 1950, there were 65,000 professional home economists of which 25,000 were members of AHEA. The AHEA currently is the accrediting association for home economists in higher education. It is also one of the 15 largest professional associations in the United States. Fifty-two thousand home economists were members of the AHEA in 1977 (Parker, 1980).

The passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 offered new opportunities for home economics to serve the people as it started a great undertaking in adult homemaking education. The Smith-Lever Act provided the machinery for carrying information from the colleges to women on the farm through the Cooperative Extension Service. This service denotes the first time the Federal Government provided for a scientific study of the problems of the home (Bevier, 1925).

By 1916 the foundations of home economics were well established in the college curriculum. The passage of the Vocational Education Act in 1917, also known as the Smith-Hughes Act helped shape home economics at the pre-collegiate and collegiate levels. This act tied home economics in college to teacher training. After the enactment of the Vocational Education Act, the land-grant colleges were the first institutions in the United States to be approved for the training of teachers of vocational schools and classes

in home economics. These schools were the logical choice as the agencies for strengthening the training for vocational teachers of home economics because they already had established well developed courses for the training of home economics teachers and had technically qualified faculty. By 1920 home economics was established in higher education with emphasis being placed on the preparation of secondary school teachers (Baylor, 1925).

In 1923, the Bureau of Home Economics was established in the United States Department of Agriculture. The home economics and agriculture alliance continues to exist throughout the world because food, clothing, and shelter come from agriculture products. In 1937 the George-Barden Act was passed, extending the provisions for vocational education (Parker, 1980).

Through the years from 1937 to the 1950's home economics grew dramatically and rapidly to meet the expanding demands of a society filled with changes created by wars, the depression, the industrial revolution, civil rights, space explorations, and other scientific and technological advances. The home economics curricula was broadened to accommodate such changes but, it became more difficult to offer one unified course of study to cover all aspects of daily life relative to the family (McGrath and Johnson, 1968).

Since the early 1960's considerable emphasis is being placed on redefining and strengthening the field of home

economics. Changes in the home economics curriculum during the late 1960's centered around the expansion and addition of majors and areas of specialization. An increase of interdisciplinary and experimental programs was evident during the 1970's. It was during the decade of the 1970's that home economics, basically, moved from a generalized field of study to specialized areas of professional education. Such changes were necessary in order to meet the demand for generalist and specialists in home economics related occupations (Harper, 1975; Weis, East, and Manning, 1974).

The increased demand for more specialized areas in home economics was motivated by economic, social, and technological changes, as well as the increase in current employment opportunities for home economists. Hoeflin et al. (1984) state that

> The demand for home economists is strong; curricula are flexible; a university degree in home economics opens the door to new adventures. Home economics is a field that prizes innovation, experimentation, and breakthroughs. Opportunities in home economics are there for those who seek leadership positions and challenges (p. 182).

They further state that

> Home economists can make significant contributions to the solutions of problems that arise as a result of current trends. The increase in single parent families, urbanization, rising standards of living, occupation emancipation of women, the need for more and more education for living and working in our complex world, and the fact that the lifespan of women is longer than that of men, reveal the need for an understanding of the lifecycle and of ways to help men and women as they go through the various stages (pp. 183-184).

Parker (1987) states that all kinds of home economists are needed to help people adjust to social changes and to influence the speed and direction of changes in living patterns, as well as to help alleviate the anxiety that accompany rapid social change. She is of the opinion that two types of professions need to be prepared by colleges and universities, the generalists and the specialists. According to Hoeflin et al. (1984)

> The results of a survey compiling information from the U.S. Department of Labor and Education indicate that through 1990 the average annual demand for college graduates in home economics is expected to be substantially more than the available supply. The estimated supply of U.S. college graduates is expected to be 7,000 graduates short of meeting the demand (p. 145).

The figure mentioned by Hoeflin et al. (1984) is a good indication of the career opportunities available to home economics graduates.

Program Evaluation in Higher Education

The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1984) concludes that our Nation is at "Risk". Due to a rising tide of mediocrity over the last two decades, the educational foundation is eroding. Educational institutions appear to have lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling and this threatens the future of the nation and its people. The Commission clearly calls for reform in the American educational system and a renewed commitment to higher quality education throughout the land. The call for

reform in education is voiced by others as well. (Levine and Weingar, 1973; and Grant and Reisman, 1978).

The American educational system is currently making an effort toward self-improvement. According to Wolf (1984), evaluation is the best process for the improvement of educational programs. It is primarily concerned with educational effectiveness. One of it's primary goals is to determine whether a program is doing what it is intended to do. According to Rossi and Freeman (1982)

> Evaluations are undertaken for different reasons: to judge the worth of ongoing programs and to estimate the usefulness of attempts to improve them; to assess the utility of innovative program and initiatives; to increase the effectiveness of program management and administration; and to meet various accountability requirements (p. 15).

Wolf (1984) is of the opinion that evaluation should lead to some type of action. He feels that any type of evaluation activity that does not contribute to the decision-making process is a waste of time and money. Wolf (1984) states that

> Evaluation must contribute to the decision-making process, notably to course improvement, if it is to have any justification in education (p. 3).

Due to the current emphasis placed on program improvement, many educational practitioners face the problem of finding the evaluation model most appropriate and relevant to their evaluation tasks. The need for some type of evaluation model is crucial in higher education because of the number of educational programs that exist in colleges and universities. Over 335 institutions of higher educa-

tion in the United States and Puerto Rico offer the bachelors or higher degrees in home economics (Harper, 1981).

Evaluation Models

Because evaluations may be conducted for a variety of reasons, the scope of each evaluation depends on the purposes for which each evaluation is being conducted. House (1978) identifies eight separate categories and clusters of evaluation models. The models differ from one another as the basic assumptions vary. When an evaluation model is selected to match the requirements of a particular program, the evaluation results are more likely to be useful for specific purposes.

Although evaluation models differ from on another there appears to be some agreement on what the major models are. Major evaluation models, according to House (1978) are, systems analysis, behavioral objectives, decision-making, goal free, accreditation, adversary, and transaction. Each of these models is distinguishable by the audiences addressed as well as the methods employed. According to House (1978), ". . . the models all assume that increased knowledge will make people happy, better, or satisfied in some way" (p. 11).

Purpose of Accreditation in Higher Education

According to House (1978), the accreditation evalua-

tion model began as a voluntary association to ward off governmental interference. Accreditation in higher education is carried on almost entirely by nongovernmental association and agencies. Blauch (1959) states that the general purpose of accreditation, as applied in education, is to promote and insure high quality in educational programs. Blauch (1959) is of the opinion that

> A fully developed accrediting procedure includes four steps: (1) Establishment of standards or criteria; (2) inspection of institutions by competent authorities to determine whether they meet the established standards or criteria; (3) publication of a list of institutions that meet the standards of criteria; and (4) periodic reviews to ascertain whether accredited institutions continue to meet the standards or criteria (p. 3).

House (1978) states that schools have united cooperatively for more than 50 years to evaluate each other. This practice is ordinarily conducted by a team of outside professionals visiting "on-site". Prior to the on-site visit, the local people have already completed a self-study according to a set of external standards. The visiting team of reviewers either commend or disapprove the local programs. They do not rank or grade the local programs. Normally, the catalog of a college or university includes a statement indicating the accredited status of the school's various programs.

Although there are several purposes for accrediting institutions of higher education, the general purpose is to promote and insure high quality in educational programs. A second purpose for accrediting is to raise the standards of

education for the practice of a profession.

Home Economics Accreditation

According to Parker (1987), home economists have been concerned with the quality of academic preparation of professionals since 1912. However, it was during the late 1960s and early 1970s before the procedures and criteria for accreditation of home economics programs were initiated, developed, and finalized.

The American Home Economics Association (AHEA) is the accrediting agency for home economics units having programs leading to a baccalaureate degree. According to Haley (1984) the primary purpose of accreditation in home economics is to provide an opportunity for students to receive quality professional undergraduate education, and to identify schools that offer programs that meet the established criteria for a quality program. Although accreditation itself does not determine institutional or program quality, it may assess it and it may enhance it. Educational quality is a characteristic of institutions and programs but not accrediting associations (Haley, 1984).

Accreditation procedures are initiated at the request of the educational institution. Failure to attain, or loss of accreditation can mean life or death to an institution or program. Although the initial accredited status may be difficult to attain, once it is received, maintaining such status is not as difficult (Millard, 1983).

The Council for Professional Development (CPD) is the official accrediting body of the AHEA. The Council conducts all of the accrediting activities. The Self-Study Report is the single most important document item in helping the CPD decide whether or not an institution is ready for a site visit, which is part of the accreditation process. Accreditation is granted for a period of 10 years. And, the criteria and guidelines for accreditation in home economics are basically qualitative in nature (Haley, 1984). Most accreditating associations began with rather prescriptive quantitative criteria.

According to Haley (1984) the objectives of accreditation in home economics are to:

> provide guidelines for high quality home economics programs; apply established criteria for accreditation of home economics programs; recognize changing needs of individuals, families and society and implement advances in knowledge and professional ability; identify and publicize qualified home economics programs; assure parents and students that the accredited program has competent faculty, sound curricula, adequate library, appropriate physical plants, sufficient equipment, and is capable of attaining announced objectives; assure business, professions, government, and graduate schools that graduates of said institution have an educational background for satisfying and productive performance (p. 11).

Parker (1987) states that the first home economics units were accredited in 1971, and, by the mid 1980s ninety of the 349 home economics programs in the United States are accredited. A list of the accredited home economics programs is published in the Journal of Home Economics every fall.

As administrators seek ways to determine the quality and effectiveness of academic curriculums and as an aid to educational planning and reform, consideration can be given to the idea of using students and alumni as reliable sources of information. According to Stadtman (1980), students provide the ultimate rationale for many of the changes that take place in higher education. Dressel (1976), states that in order to evaluate a curriculum, opinions should be sought from faculty, employees, and students entering and completing an academic program.

Follow-Up Studies

Accreditation agencies typically require systematic follow-up of program graduates. Such follow-up efforts usually seek objective information regarding the current status of former students as well as opinions concerning the graduates' perceptions of the the adequacy of their training (Gay, 1981). In the AHEA Accreditation Documents for Undergraduate Programs in Home Economics (Haley, 1984), criterion 8.6 specifically addresses the need for the follow-up of graduates in order to assess various aspects of their professional preparations.

Follow-up studies are usually conducted after a period of time has elapsed. These studies are popular in education because they are useful tools for educational fact finding. School boards, administrators, and teachers can learn a great deal about an educational curriculum without

contacting every participant (Kerlinger, 1973).

Fain (1981) states that follow-up studies can evaluate professional preparation programs which establish a basis for success in positions accepted by graduates of an educational institution. According to MacDonald (1985) a follow-up study has significant implications for theory and practice. She is of the belief that opinions obtained by a follow-up study can indicate experiences which should be obtained, eliminated, or revised in the professional program as they relate to preparation for employment.

Generally speaking, follow-up studies focus on individuals who have completed a treatment or course of study. Such studies examine what has happened to people as a result of the impact of institutions and programs. Follow-up studies enable an institution to evaluate the results of various aspects of its program. By contacting program graduates, one can assess the adequacy or inadequacy of the institution's programs. One can assess how the programs of study have affected the personal and professional development of the graduates (Best, 1981).

Most follow-up studies have focused on occupational and economic status, success in further study, satisfaction with the educational experience, and benefits of college (Pace, 1985). Establishing the purpose of a follow-up study helps to determine the questionnaire content and frequency of follow-up.

Accreditation and government reporting requirements

are a major external impetus for student follow-up studies. Kirk (1982) states that if it were not for mandates of accreditation standards many school would probably neglect to study the outcomes of their own efforts. There can be little doubt that the AHEA standards have stimulated follow-up studies of home economics program graduates.

Chapter Summary

This review of literature is focused on six areas that are discussed in order to bring relevance to the need to conduct follow-up studies as a means to improve educational programs. America is committed to achieving excellence in its educational institutions. Thus, the goal in higher education is to develop the talents of all students to their fullest. High quality education allows the student to proceed to higher development in life. One can say that the quality of an educational program is reflected in the quality of its students and alumni.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The first part of this section discusses the research design. The second section describes the sample and tells how and why the participants were selected. The third and fourth sections of this chapter describes the instruments used to gather data and the data collection techniques. The fifth section describes the procedures used for analysis of nonrespondents bias. The final section of this chapter addresses the data analysis methods used.

Research Design

In order to achieve the purpose of this study, survey research was utilized. Kerlinger (1973) reported that

> . . . survey research is a useful tool for board of education, or a staff of teachers can learn a great deal about a school system or a community without contacting every child, every teacher, and every citizen (p. 421).

By using the survey research techniques, a large amount of information about an educational situation can be retrieved without contacting everybody involved in the situation. Survey researchers study samples drawn from populations. Then they infer the sample characteristics to the population (Kerlinger, 1973).

Joseph and Joseph (1984) stated that survey research is usually limited to the study of human beings, or of variables that depend on human response, or human behavior. Although there is no best survey method in the abstract, any method chosen should be tailored to the objectives of the research. Each method has certain strengths and weaknesses. Dillman (1978) stated that

> the researcher who wants to survey alumni of a major university who are likely to be scattered among the 50 states and several foreign countries probably only has one choice - the mail questionnaire (pp. 39-40).

According to Ewell (1985) the mailed survey is the most common technique used in student follow-up studies. This method of data collection is popular primarily because of its relatively low cost and high reliability.

Sample Selection

The population for this study consisted of all individuals who completed requirements for the baccalaureate degree in the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University during the academic years of January, 1980 through December, 1984. These years were chosen in order to show consistency in conducting periodic follow-up of graduates during one, three, and five year time periods as recommended by Fain (1981).

According to figures obtained from the Director of Academic Affairs in the College of Home Economics, there were a total of 1107 graduates with a baccalaureate degree

from the College of Home Economics during the years 1980 through 1984. It was determined that 285 respondents would be a representative sample size for this population. This number was determined by using the "Table for Determining Sample Size for a Given Population" (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970).

The research sample was selected by using the stratified random sampling technique. The population was subdivided into small groups according to the year of graduation and major in home economics. Approximately 25% of the population graduated during the 1980 academic year, therefore, 25% of the sample were selected from the 1980 graduates. About 20% of the population graduated during 1981 and another 20% during 1982, therefore, about 20% of the samples were selected from each of these years. The remaining 17% and 18% of the sample were selected from the years 1983 and 1984 respectively.

According to Best (1981), the stratified random sampling technique allowed the researcher to get an accurate representation of the population. Otherwise, one could select a preponderance of graduates from one particular year. The stratified random sampling technique was implemented by listing the name, student identification number, and major for each graduate according to the year and semester graduated. After the graduates were listed as stated above, they were numbered consecutively for each year and randomly selected by using a table of random numbers. The

sample was considered representative because each graduate had a chance to be included in the sampling process.

Instrumentation

The survey instruments used to collect the data for this study consisted of two self-administered questionnaires. One of the questionnaires was a revision of the Professional Preparation and Employment Survey of Selected Graduates from the Division of Home Economics Questionnaire (PPESQ), developed by Fain (1981) at Oklahoma State University. Fain designed the questionnaire to obtain information from home economics graduates for the academic year 1974, 1976, and 1979. The PPESQ was designed to obtain information relating to personal demographic data, current and past employment, job satisfaction, reasons for current career choices, and opinions about professional preparation programs, as well as opinions about personal and professional involvement.

Since Fain's instrument sought some of the information this researcher was seeking, she was contacted by telephone to seek permission to use the instrument. Fain responded in the affirmative and gave her permission for the instruction to be used. She also mailed some additional information concerning the study that she felt would be useful to this particular research effort. Although the instrument was revised for this study, it still retained four parts. Part I was concerned with Demographic Data, Part II was concerned

with Employment Data, Part III was concerned with Professional Data, and Part IV with Involvement Data (See Appendix A).

Although Fain (1981) did not mention the reliability or validity of the PPESQ, she did state that after the initial development of the instrument, it was reviewed by a panel of judges, then pilot tested twice. The adequacy of the instructions, the clarity and appropriateness of the items, and the length of time needed to complete the questionnaire were all evaluated during the pilot studies.

For this study validity of the questionnaire was assessed by a total of six experts in the field of home economics. One person from each of the six departments in the College of Home Economics was asked to examine the questionnaire and judge its adequacy for assessing the opinions of the graduates concerning their job satisfaction and professional preparation.

In order to establish the reliability of the questionnaire used in this study, the test-retest procedure was used. Sixteen names were randomly selected from the remaining population, who were not part of the research sample, to help establish reliability of the instrument. They were asked to complete the questionnaire within three days after receiving it and return it in an enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope. After a 10 day period, they received a second copy of the questionnaire to complete and return. A Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation of .82

was obtained from this test-retest procedure. Kerlinger (1973) stated

> Reliability, while not the most important facet of measurement, is still extremely important. In a way, this is like the money problem: the lack of it is the real problem. High reliability is no guarantee of good scientific results, but there can be no good scientific results without reliability (p. 455).

The second part of the instrument consisted of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Short Form. The MSQ is a standardized instrument that is used to measure job satisfaction. Permission by the author was obtained to use the MSQ in this study. The MSQ Short form contains 20 items which assess several job satisfaction factors.

According to Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967), the MSQ is easy to read, meets accepted standards for reliability, and it shows evidence of validity. Hoyt reliability coefficients varied from .87 to .92. Median reliability coefficients were .86 for Intrinsic Satisfaction, .80 for Extrinsic Satisfaction and .90 for General Satisfaction.

Weiss et al. (1967) stated that validity of the MSQ short-form may be inferred from validity for the MSQ long form. Validity for the long form is said to be derived mainly from its performing according to theoretical expectations-construct validity. According to Albright (1972), other evidence of validity is inferred from the ability of the MSQ to discriminate between occupational groups.

Data Collection

A total of 1107 undergraduates received baccaulaureate degrees during the years 1980 to 1984. In May of 1986 the questionnaires were mailed to 285 graduates who were selected as the representative sample for this study. Along with the questionnaires, the graduates received a letter requesting their participation in the study (See Appendix B), and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. The first mailing resulted in the return of 82 completed questionnaires. Thirty-one questionnaires were returned with incorrect addresses.

After an approximate six week period of time, a follow-up letter (See Appendix B) was mailed in June of 1986 to 90 of the graduates who did not respond to the first request for their participation in the study. Another copy of the instrument and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope were mailed with the second follow-up letter. The follow-up mailing resulted in 63 returned questionnaires. These two first class mailings resulted in the return of 142 usable questionnaires. This total number of returned usable questionnaires represents about a 50% response rate. Additional questionnaires were received after the analysis of the data, but were not included in this research.

Apart from the information requested on the mail questionnaires additional information was obtained from student folders in the office of the Director of Academic Affairs in the College of Home Economics. Information pertaining to

the graduates' sex, major, minor, year graduated, semester graduated, grade point average, scholarships, internships, and transfers was obtained from the student folders. In order to protect the identity of each graduate, identification numbers were used on the questionnaires rather than name. Any names written on the questionnaires were blotted out before coding the data.

Analysis of Non-respondents

A subsample of 12 non-respondents was randomly taken in order to ensure that there were no significant differences between the characteristics of the respondents and the non-respondents. If the non-respondents are like the respondents then the results can be generalized to the population. According to Kerlinger (1973)

> Responses to mail questionnaires are generally poor. Returns of less than 40 or 50 are common. Higher percentages are rare. At best, the researcher must content himself with returns as low as 50 or 60 percent (p. 414).

Whipple, Thomas, and Muffo (1982) stated that the simplest method of dealing with potential non-respondent bias is to assume that respondents and non-respondents have the same characteristics. A second method of dealing with potential non-respondents bias is to compare known demographics of the respondents and the non-respondents. Although there are disadvantages associated with comparing demographics, it is an improvement over the method of assumption.

The Chi-square (X^2) technique was used to determine if

there was a significant difference between the demographic characteristics of the respondents and the non-respondents. Results of the X^2 analyses indicated that there were no significant differences between the respondents and the non-respondents (Table 1). Therefore, it is assumed that the respondents and the non-respondents are alike and the research results can be generalized to the population.

TABLE I

RESPONDENTS' AND NON-RESPONDENTS DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES COMPARISON

Variable	df	X^2	Probability
Sex	1	0.017	0.90
Major	5	3.673	0.60
Year Graduated	4	5.486	0.24
GPA	4	4.735	0.31
Internship	1	0.054	0.82

$p = .05$

Analyses of the Data

Information received from the 142 usable questionnaires was individually hand coded on fortran coding forms and then

entered onto a floppy disk. Three data files were set up on the disk to make it easier to enter and correct input errors in the data. A hard copy of the data on the disk was printed to review for error detection and correction. After all the obvious errors were corrected, all the data were transferred to the mainframe computer and combined into one data file. Primarily, the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) programs were used for the analysis of the data.

The first analysis provided statistical frequency distributions by summarizing the raw data and the percentage of respondents to each item. The second analysis involved the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical method for testing the stated null hypotheses. The simple one-way analysis of variance was used to test statistically significant differences between the major, grade point average, current job title, year of graduation, and the graduates' perceptions of their professional preparation, and their job satisfaction.

The second hypothesis of the study states there will be no statistically significant relationship between the graduates contribution to the professional and professional growth, and their perceived job satisfaction and perceived professional preparation. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to test this hypothesis. According to Gay (1981), the Pearson's r is the most stable measure of correlation. It is most appropriate when the data represent either interval or ratio levels of measure-

ments. One assumption associated with the use of the Pearson's r is that the variables being correlated have a linear relationship.

The F-test allows the researcher to compare means to see if there are significant differences between or among the means. The .05 level of confidence was used as a criterion for supporting the null hypothesis throughout the study. The Duncan's Multiple Range was used as a post hoc comparison test to identify where significant differences lie after a significant F ratio was obtained (Huck, Cromier and Bound, 1974).

Chapter Summary

This chapter gave a description of the methods and procedures undertaken to complete this study. Following survey research techniques, a stratified random sample was selected in proportion to the number of graduates in the population who graduated each year from Oklahoma State University in Home Economics. The survey instrument consisted of two self-administered questionnaires. One was a revised follow-up instrument from an earlier study and the other was a standardized instrument to measure job satisfaction.

Data were retrieved from 142 responses, representing an overall 50% response rate. Analysis of the data was completed using Statistical Analysis System (SAS) procedures.

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND ANALYSES

The purpose of this follow-up study was to assess differences in baccalaureate graduates' perceptions of their professional preparation and job satisfaction relative to their year of graduation, major, GPA, and current job title. A further purpose of this study was to assess if the graduates' contributions to the profession and professional growth are associated with their perceived professional preparation and perceived job satisfaction. The total number of graduates participating in the study was 142 individuals who received baccalaureate degrees in home economics at Oklahoma State University.

This chapter presents analyses of the data collected in this study. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) program at Oklahoma State University. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation were the statistical procedure used to determine if significant differences existed between responses relative to the independent and dependent variables. Throughout the study the .05 level of probability was established as a criterion for supporting or failing to support the null hypotheses.

Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

The demographic characteristics of the graduates who returned questionnaires are presented in this section. Their employment data are also presented in this section.

Demographic Data

The data in Table II present the demographic characteristics of the graduates. The sample consisted of 142 respondents, 128 (93%) were female, and ten (7%) were male. With the home economics profession being predominantly female, these numbers follow the typical pattern in home economics.

Of the 142 respondents, 129 (94%) were Caucasian and five (4%) were Black Americans. Three (2%) of the respondents were classified as "other", representing the ethnic groups of Asian and American Indian.

Eighty three (60%) of the respondents were married, 45 (33%) were never married, and eight (6%) were divorced or separated. Only one (1%) of the respondents was a widow.

The majority of the graduates did not have any children (97). Sixteen of the respondents reported that they had at least one child under 1 year old. The respondents reported having a total of 20 children from 1 to 5 years of age. None of the respondents reported having any children in the 6 to 10 years age range. A total of three children was reported in the 11 to 15 years category. One of the respondents reported having one child from 16-20 years of age.

Some the graduates reported having more than one child and some of the graduates reported having adult age children.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION BY YEAR GRADUATED OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR SELECTED GRADUATES

Demographic Data	Year Graduated 1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	Total
	N	N	N	N	N	
Sex						
Female	27	21	25	26	29	128
Male	2	2	1	2	3	10
Missing						4
Race						
Caucasian	25	23	26	25	30	129
Black American	0	0	0	3	2	5
Other	3	0	0	0	0	3
Missing						5
Marital Status						
Married	20	16	17	16	14	83
Never Married	6	4	8	12	15	45
Divorced/Separated	2	3	1	0	2	8
Widowed	0	0	0	0	1	1
Missing						5
Age Group of Children						
Under 1 year	3	3	6	3	1	16
1 - 5 years	7	6	4	2	1	20
6 -10 years	0	0	0	0	0	0
11-15 years	0	1	2	0	0	3
16-20 years	0	0	0	0	1	1
No Children	19	13	17	23	25	97
Missing						5

The frequency distribution for the graduates' overall grade point average is presented in Table III. Fifty two (38.0%) reported having GPAs between 2.6 and 3.0. Forty six

(33.6%) reported having GPAs between 3.1 and 3.5. Only two (1.5%) of the graduates reported having a GPA of 2.0 and below.

TABLE III

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF OVERALL GRADE POINT AVERAGE

GPA	Frequency	Percent
3.6 - 4.0	15	10.9
3.1 - 3.5	46	33.6
2.6 - 3.0	52	38.0
2.1 - 2.5	22	16.1
2.0 - below	2	1.5
Total	137	100
5 missing		

The frequency distribution for the number of graduates by year is presented in Table IV. The number of graduates by the year graduated and by major is presented in Table V. Approximately 23% of the respondents graduated in 1984 while only 16.8% graduated in 1981.

TABLE IV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR YEAR GRADUATED

Year Graduated	Frequency	Percent
1980	28	20.4
1981	23	16.8
1982	26	19.0
1983	28	20.4
1984	32	23.4
Total	137	100
5 missing		

TABLE V

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY YEAR GRADUATED AND MAJOR

	Major						
Year Graduated	CTM	FRCD	FNIA	HEECS	HRA	HIDCS	Total
1980	9	7	4	3	2	4	29
1981	4	6	4	5	1	3	23
1982	11	7	1	3	4	0	26
1983	7	7	2	4	3	5	28
1984	4	13	3	2	4	6	32
Total	35	40	14	17	14	18	138
4 missing							

Employment Data

The data in Table VI presents the current employment status of the selected graduates. One hundred-four (76%) of the graduated were employed full-time (40 hours or more per week), while 9 of the graduates (7%) were employed part-time (less than 40 hours per week). Three of the graduates (2%) reported they were not employed, and 21 or 15% reported they were either self-employed, a homemaker or other. The items for "other" under current employment status contained one response indicating the respondent was undergoing a relocation process.

Current Employment

The current job title, employer, and employer addresses were collapsed into smaller categories for ease of reporting. Rather than list all of the current job titles reported by the respondents, three categories were identified for current job titles. The first category was classified as "professional". Any job title which indicated that the occupation required extensive study or experience was placed in the professional category. Any job title where it was obvious that the functions of the graduate were mental rather than manual were also classified as professional. Some of the job titles that were placed in the "professional" category included elementary, secondary, or college teacher; dietitian, educational counselor, or administrator were also classified as professional.

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR AND CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS FOR GRADUATES

Major	Employment Status: Full-time (40 hrs. or more)	Part-time (less than 40 hrs.)	Not Employed	Other	Total
	N	N	N	N	
Clothing, Textiles, and Merchandising	32	0	0	3	35
Family Relations and Child Development	28	3	0	9	39
Food, Nutrition, and Institutional Administration	7	4	0	3	14
Home Economics Education and Community Services	11	1	2	3	17
Hotel and Restaurant Administration	13	0	0	1	14
Housing, Interior Design and Consumer Resources	14	1	1	2	18
Total	104	9	3	21	137
Percent	76	7	2	15	100

5 Missing

The second category for current job title was classified as "non-professional". Job titles which indicated that the graduate assisted another worker of a higher ranking of competence or expertise were classified as non-professional. Some of the job titles which were classified as non-professional were child care assistant, secretary or clerk, and assistant buyer. Several miscellaneous job titles that could not be classified as professional or service/private enterprise were classified as non-professional.

The third and final category for current job title was classified as "service/private enterprise". Any job title which indicated that the occupation was concerned with providing services for people, animals, or personal effects, was classified as service/private enterprise. Job titles which indicated that the occupation was connected with a business organization were also classified as service/private enterprise. Job titles associated with sells of a product or calls on management were classified as service/private enterprise as well. Some of the job titles placed in this category included buyer, sales representative, and fabric coordinator.

Table VII presents the frequency distribution for current job title. Fifty seven former students (45.5%) reported they were currently employed in professional positions. Eleven respondents (8.8%) reported they were currently employed in non-professional positions. Fifty seven (45.5%) respondents reported they were currently employed in service/private enterprise positions.

TABLE VII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CURRENT JOB TITLE

Job Title	Frequency	Percent
Professional	57	45.5
Non-Professional	11	9.0
Service/Private Enterprise	57	45.5
Total	125	100
17 missing		

The frequency distribution of the name of current employer is presented in Table VIII. The name of the current employer was condensed into four categories of public, private, self, and other. Public employers were employers whose financial support was derived from the general public. Any type of city, state, or federal employer was considered public, this included schools, colleges, and the cooperative extension service.

The private employers were the employers whose financial support was derived from non-public sources. A number of businesses were considered to be private employers. If a respondent indicated that they were self employed then their response was classified as self employed. They did not work for any other public or private enterprise.

Thirty-nine (31.2%) of the respondents reported that

their current employer was a public employer. Seventy-eight (62.4%) reported that their current employer was a private employer. Four of the respondents (3.2%) were self employed, and four (3.2%) were employed by employers of other nature. The "other" category items were specified by respondents. However, after investigation, it was found they could be categorized as public/private enterprises.

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF NAME OF CURRENT EMPLOYER

Employer	Frequency	Percent
Public	39	31.2
Private	78	62.4
Self	4	3.2
Other	4	3.2
17 missing		

The addresses of the current employer were condensed into two categories for ease of reporting. The categories were condensed to in-state employment or out-of-state employment. Eighty (64.5%) of the graduates responded that their current employment was located within the state of

Oklahoma. Forty-four (35.5%) of the graduates responded that their current employment was located outside the state of Oklahoma (See Table IX).

TABLE IX

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ADDRESS OF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Address	Frequency	Percent
In-State	80	64.5
Out-of-State	44	35.5
Total	124	100

18 missing

Table X presents the frequency distribution indicating the major responsibility of the current position for the graduates. Thirty-one (24.8%) of the graduates listed their major responsibility as something "other" than what was specified by the categories on the questionnaire. The "other" category item were specified in Appendix C. Twenty seven (21.6%) of the graduates reported the major responsibility of their current position to be teaching (formal or informal groups); while 21 (16.8%) had the major responsibility of management, and 16 (12.8%) had the major responsibility of marketing and sales.

TABLE X

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY OF CURRENT POSITION

Responsibility	Frequency	Percent
Buying/Merchandising	9	7.2
Designing/Drafting	9	7.2
Food Service Delivery/Service	4	3.2
Health Care Delivery/Service	5	4.0
Management	21	16.8
Marketing/Sales	16	12.8
Product Development/Testing	1	0.8
Research	1	0.8
Teaching (formal or informal groups)	27	21.6
Other	31	24.8

18 missing

As indicated in Table XI, 74 (59.2%) of the graduates described their current employer as Business/Industry. The second greatest number of graduates, 22 (17.6%) described their current employer as Public/Private educational school system (K through 12th grades). The third greatest number of graduates, 12 (9.6%), described their current employer as Government (city, state, or federal). The fourth greatest number of graduates, 8 (6.4%) described their current employer as "other". The "other" current employers were placed in Appendix C.

TABLE XI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT EMPLOYER

Current Employer	Frequency	Percent
Business/Industry	74	59.2
Four-year College/University	3	2.4
Government (city, state, or federal)	12	9.6
Non-profit Organization	5	4.0
Public/Private Educational School System (K through 12th grades)	22	17.6
Two-year College/Technical Institute	1	0.8
Other	8	6.4
17 missing		

A summary of the frequency distribution of the reasons given by the graduates for accepting their current positions is provided in Table XII. The most prevalent reason given for accepting their current position was: individually challenging and/or reward work. Forty-seven (37.6%) of the graduates indicated this reason. Thirteen (10.4) graduates indicated they accepted their current position because of opportunities for advancement. The "other" reasons for accepting current positions were listed in Appendix C.

TABLE XII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF REASON FOR ACCEPTING CURRENT POSITION

Reason	Frequency	Percent
Convenient work hours	8	6.4
Geographical location	9	7.2
Individually challenging and/or rewarding work	47	37.6
Only Job Offer	10	8.0
Opportunities for advancement	13	10.4
Salary and fringe benefits	8	6.4
Sole provider for self or self and dependents	10	8.0
Supplement family income	8	6.4
To follow spouse	1	0.8
Other	11	8.8
Total	125	100

17 missing

The sources used by the graduates to obtain their current employment is presented in Table XIII. Forty-one (33.1%) indicated their best source to be a friend or relative. Twenty-two (17.7%) indicated their best source to be the newspaper want advertisements; and, 15 (12.1%) indicated that the university placement office was their best source. Twenty-eight graduates (22.6%) indicated their course, used to obtained their current employment, to be something "other" than what was listed in the questionnaire. The specific sources were listed in Appendix C.

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SOURCES USED TO OBTAIN CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Source	Frequency	Percent
Commercial employment agency	4	3.2
Friend or relative	41	33.1
Government register (city, state, or federal)	1	0.8
Job announcement from personnel department	1	0.8
Newspaper want ads	22	17.7
Promotion from within organization	12	9.7
University Placement Office	15	12.1
Other	28	22.6

The annual salary of the respondents is presented in Table XIV. Forty-three (35%) of the respondents earned between $15,000 and $20,000 annually. Nineteen (15%) earned over $25,000 a year and 11 (9%) earned less than $10,000 a year.

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY FOR ANNUAL SALARY

Salary	Frequency	Percent
$5,000 - $ 9,999	11	8.9
$10,000 - $14,999	29	23.4
$15,000 - $19,999	43	34.7
$20,000 - $24,999	22	17.7
$25,000 or more	19	15.3
Total	124	100
18 missing		

Data Analyses and Results

Findings

The stated objectives of this study were (1) to assess if the major, GPA, year graduated, and current job title are associated with the graduates perceptions of their professional preparation and their job satisfaction, and (2) to assess if the graduates' contributions to the profession, and their professional growth are associated with, and their perceived professional preparation and job satisfaction. The following null hypothesis was developed regarding the first objective.

H_1: There will be no statistically significant differences between the major, GPA, year graduated, current job

title, and the graduates perceptions of their professional preparation, and their job satisfaction.

Perceptions of Professional Preparation

One-way analysis of variance, F, (ANOVA) was used to determine if significant differences were present for the variables of major, GPA, year graduated, current job title as associated with perceptions of professional preparation and job satisfaction. The F test disclosed that there was no statistically significant differences for the GPA, F=1.05, p=0.3841, year graduated, F=1.34, p=0.8610, current job title, F=1.34, p=0.2655, and the graduates' perception of their professional preparation (Table XV). Therefore, part of H_1 was accepted.

A significant difference for the graduates perception of their professional preparation occurred in the F test based on the graduates major (F=283, p=0.0188); thus, part of the null hypothesis was rejected. The findings do not appear to be in direct support of research conducted by Woods (1983). Her findings indicated that the college major does not demonstrate a relationship with the general rating of undergraduate academic training at the .05 level of significance. Although Woods (1983) did not find any significant relationship between undergraduate training, she stated that there did seem to be a trend toward such a relationship (p=.093).

TABLE XV

ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION BY, GPA, YEAR GRADUATED, CURRENT JOB-TITLE AND MAJOR

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Probability
GPA					
Model	4	155.98	38.99	1.05	0.3841
Error	126	4678.22	37.13		
Total	130	4834.20			
Year Graduated					
Model	4	49.19	12.30	0.32	0.8616
Error	126	4785.01	37.98		
Total	130	4834.20			
Current Job Title					
Model	2	97.07	48.53	1.34	0.2655
Error	119	4306.61	36.19		
Total	121	4403.68			
Major					
Model	5	490.49	98.10	2.83	0.0188 *
Error	126	4374.44	37.72		
Total	131	4864.93			

* $p < .05$

On the other hand, MacDonald (1985) found in her research that graduates perceptions about adequacy of preparation for professional positions varied by department. She found that students who graduated from the Family and Child Ecology department believed they were better prepared for employment than did graduates from the department of Food Science and Human Nutrition, who in turn felt better prepared than students who graduated from the Human Environment and Design department.

The Duncan's multiple range test was used as a follow-up procedure to locate where the significant differences were found among graduates in their perceived professional preparation and their major. Table XVI presents the results of the Duncan's multiple range test. It appears that FRCD, FNIA and HRA majors differed significantly in their perceptions of their professional preparation. However, these differences may be related to difference in size.

TABLE XVI

DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND MAJOR

MAJOR	FRCD	CTM	HEECS	HIDCS	FNIA	HRA
	N=36	N=35	N=16	N=18	N=14	N=13
MEAN	41.19	38.45	38.18	37.44	36.00	35.46
a	_____					
b		_____	_____	_____		

[a] Means underscored by the same line do not differ significantly from one another (Huck, Cormier and Bounds, 1974).

Perceived Job Satisfaction

In this study, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to measure job satisfaction of graduates. The second part of H_1 was stated to relate the graduates perceived job satisfaction with their major, GPA, year graduated, and current job title. Results of F test procedures indicated that there were no significant differences found between the graduates perceived job satisfaction, and their current job title (Table XVII). Therefore, the second part of H_1 that relates to the graduates perceived job satisfaction and their major, GPA, year graduated, and current job title was accepted.

Correlations Between Selected Variables

The following null hypothesis was developed regarding the second objective of this study. H_2: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the graduates contribution to the profession, their professional growth, and their perceived job satisfaction and professional preparation.

The Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient (r) was used to study the relationship between the variables stated above in order to determine if any relationship existed among them. A significance level of .05 was set as the level of acceptance (Table XVIII). Correlations shown in Table XVIII indicate that there are low positive rela-

TABLE XVII

ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR JOB SATISFACTION BY MAJOR, GPA, YEAR GRADUATED, AND CURRENT JOB-TITLE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Probability
Major					
Model	5	692.82	138.56	1.18	0.3221
Error	115	13476.70	117.19		
Total	120	14169.52			
GPA					
Model	4	1006.18	251.55	2.20	0.0730
Error	115	13129.78	114.17		
Total	119	14135.97			
Year Graduated					
Model	4	843.71	210.93	1.82	0.1288
Error	115	13292.25	115.58		
Total	119	14135.97			
Current Job Title					
Model	2	43.00	21.50	0.18	0.8359
Error	114	13655.47	119.78		
Total	116	13698.48			

tionships between three pairs of variables, (1) between professional preparation and employment status, (2) between employment status and organizational participation, and (3) between organizational participation and contribution to the profession. There appeared to be a stronger relationship between professional preparation and employment status (r=0.34). The relationship between employment status and organizational participation appeared to be about the same (r=0.30) as that for professional preparation and employment status. The relationship between organizational participation and contribution to the profession appeared to be the weakest (r=0.20).

TABLE XVIII

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

Variables	1	2	3	4
1. Professional preparation	1.00	0.34*	0.09	0.06
2. Employment Code		1.00	0.30*	0.10
3. Summary of Organizational Participation			1.00	0.20*
4. Contribution to the Profession				1.00

* Significant at the .05 level of significance

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section provides a summary of the study, its design, and major findings. The second section is focused on conclusions reached as a result of the data analysis. The third section of this chapter contain some recommendations for further research.

Summary of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was to conduct a follow-up study of former undergraduate students of the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University in order to ascertain differences in their perceptions of their professional preparation and job satisfaction in relation to the year graduated, GPA, major and current position. Also, to assess if the graduate's contribution to the profession and professional growth is associated with professional preparation and job satisfaction. To achieve this purpose, survey research design was utilized.

Data were collected by mailing two self administered questionnaires to the randomly selected sample of graduates. The graduates were asked to complete the questionnaires and

return them in a self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed in the mailing. Reliability of one of the questionnaires was established by test-retest procedures. The second questionnaire was a reputable instrument with known reliability and validity.

Statistical procedures used for data analysis included the chi-square technique, one-way analysis of variance procedures, and the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient technique. The study was designed to test the following hypotheses.

H_1: There will be no statistically significant differences between the major, GPA, year of graduation, and the graduate's perceptions of their professional preparation and their job satisfaction.

H_2: There will be no statistically significant association between the graduate's contribution to the profession, professional growth and their perceived job satisfaction and professional preparation.

Findings of the Study

The analysis of the data procedures led to the following findings.

1. The majority of the graduates were female (92.75%); Caucasian (94.15%); married (60.58%); with no children (97 of 142 respondent had no children).
2. The majority of the graduates were employed full

time (76%). Approximately half were employed in professional positions (45.5%), and almost half were employed in service related occupations and private enterprise (45.5%). A small percentage (9.0%) of the graduates were employed in non-professional positions.

3. About two-thirds (64.5%) of the graduates were employed in the state of Oklahoma. The other third (35.5%) were employed in states other than Oklahoma.
4. The major occupational responsibility of the greatest percent of the graduates related to teaching (21.6%). A substantial proportion of the graduates had major occupational responsibility in management (16.8%). The greatest proportion (24.8%) of the graduates listed the major responsibility of their current position as something "other" than what was specified on the questionnaire (See Appendix C, Table XIX). Very few of the graduates had major occupational responsibility in research (0.8%).
5. About 60% of the graduates described their current employer as a business or industry. Seventeen percent of the graduates described their current employer as a public or private educational school system (K through 12th grade).
6. The majority of the graduates were traditional college age students (18-22 years old), at the time

of their graduation.

7. Almost 37% of the graduates accepted their current position because it was individually challenging and/or rewarding work. A less percentage of graduates accepted their current position because of opportunities for advancement.
8. About one-third of the graduates indicated that a friend or relative was the source used to obtain their current employment. Almost one-fourth of the graduates use sources not listed in the questionnaire to obtain their current position (See Appendix C, Table XXII). About 17% of the graduates used the newspaper want advertisements and 12% used the university placement office. Very few graduates used commercial employment agency (3.2%), or a government register (0.8%).
9. Over one-third (34.7%) of the graduates earned an annual salary that was more than $15,000. Approximately 15% of the graduates earned $25,000 of more annually.

Conclusions

The analysis of the data and findings of the study led to the following conclusions.

1. The majority of the graduates perceived that their undergraduate program had contributed to their personal and professional development. They did

not differ significantly by GPA, year graduated, and current job title. There was a significant difference by major. The Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that there was a significant difference between FRCD majors and the FNIA and HRA majors concerning their professional/personal development.

2. There were no significant differences between the graduates perceived job satisfaction and their major, GPA, year graduated, and current job title.
3. Significant relationships were found between professional preparation and current job title, (0.34), between current job title and organizational participation and contribution to the profession (0.20). It appeared that graduates who were employed in professional and service type occupations were more satisfied with their professional preparation. It also appeared that professional service workers are more likely to participate in some type of organization. Also, it appears that as graduates become more involved with professional organizations, they are more likely to participate in other organizations as well.

Recommendations

As a result of the finding and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are proposed.

1. The College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University should make a concerted effort to recruit more non-traditional students into the programs of study encompassed in the college.
2. A periodic follow-up of graduates should be continued in order to obtain feedback from graduates concerning their professional preparation and to assess academic programs.
3. A telephone follow-up or interview follow-up should be used in order to increase the response rate to future mail surveys.
4. A 10 or 20 year longitudinal study should be conducted in order to document the impact of education on home economics program graduates.
5. A comparison should be made across academic disciplines to determine the level of satisfaction of home economics graduates in comparison to graduates in other disciplines concerning their professional preparation.
6. Further study should be done to investigate differences in perceptions of professional preparation by majors.
7. The instrument should be revised in order to survey the mobility of graduates of the College of Home Economics.
8. Undergraduate students should be encouraged to actively participate in the student member section

of professional organizations associated with their majors.

9. Program follow-up evaluation should be conducted that encompasses needs of employers of home economics graduates.
10. The study should be replicated to include the number of graduates that become certified and whether certification has an influence on the graduates perceptions pertaining to their professional preparation and job satisfaction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, M.K. (1981). A follow-up study of the Nazarene Colleges home economics graduates. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stillwater: Oklahoma State University.

Albright, L.E. (1972). Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. In O.K. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements yearbook: Vol. II. (pp. 1492-1494). Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon.

American Home Economics Association. (1975) Home economics: New directions II. Journal of Home Economics, 1975, 67(3), 26-27.

Baylor, A.S. (1925). Training of vocational teachers of home economics. In W.C. John (Ed.), Land-grant College Education 1910-1920, part V: Home economics (pp. 63-65). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Best, J.W. (1981). Research in education (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Bevier, I. (1925). Development of the field of home economics. In W.C. John (Ed.), Land-grant College Education, 1910-1920, Part V: Home economics. (pp. 7-12). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Blauch, L.E. (Ed.). (1959). Accreditation in higher education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Bowen, H.R. (1974). Evaluating institutions for accountability. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Branegan, G.A. (1929). Home economics teacher training under the Smith-Hughes Act 1917 to 1927. New York: Columbia University.

Budig, G.A. (Ed.). (1981). Higher education surviving the 1980s. West Virginia: West Virginia University.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1975). More than survival: Prospects for higher education in a period of uncertainty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carver, M.N. (1979). Home economics as an academic discipline: A short history (Topical Paper No. 15). Tucson: University of Arizona.

Deshler, D. (Ed.). (1984). Evaluation for program improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dillman, D.A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys the total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dressell, P.L. (1976). Handbook of academic evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

East, M. (1980). Home economics - past, present, and future. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ewell, P.T. (Ed.). (1985). Assessing educational outcomes. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fain, N.C. (1981). Professional preparation and employment status of selected Oklahoma State University home economics graduates: A follow-up study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stillwater; Oklahoma State University.

Gay, L.R. (1981). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application (2nd ed.).

Grant, G., & Reisman, D. (1978). The perpetual dream. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Haley, E.G. (Ed.). (1984). Accreditation documents for undergraduate programs in home economics. Washington, DC: American Home Economics Association, Council for Professional Development.

Harper, L.J. (1975). Home economics in higher education. Journal of Home Economics, 3(67), 7-10.

Harper, L.J. (1981). Home economics in higher education: Status and trends 1980. Journal of Home Economics, 1(73), 14-18.

Harrison, F. (1925). Home economics teacher training in land-grant colleges from 1910 to 1920. In W.C. John (Ed.), Land-grant college education 1910-1920, Part V: Home economics (pp. 57-63). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Hoeflin, R., Pence, K., Miller, M.G., & Weber, J. (1984). Careers for professionals: New perspectives in home economics (2nd ed.). Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.

House, E.R. (1978). Assumptions underlying evaluation models. Educational Researcher, 7(3), 4-12.

Huck, S.W., Cromier, W.H., & Bounds, W.G. (1974). Reading statistics and research. New York: Harper & Row.

Joseph, M.J., & Joseph, W.D. (1984). Research fundamentals in home economics (2nd ed.). Minneapolis: Burgess.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Khademi, M. (1984). A follow-up study of graduates of the school of education of Texas Southern University from 1978-1982 (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Southern University, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 883A.

Kirk, E.L. (1982). Follow-up studies of teacher education program graduates. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Abilene: Abilene Christian University.

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.

Lee, S.M., & Van Horn, J.C. (1983). Academic administration: Planning, budgeting, and decision making with multiple objectives. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

Levine, A., & Weingart, J. (1973). Reform of undergraduate education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

MacDonald, E.D. (1985). Assessment of preparation as a professional: A follow-up study of Michigan State University's 1978-79 and 1982-83 college of human ecology baccalaureate graduates (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 445A.

McGrath, E.J., & Johnson, J.T. (1968). The changing mission of home economics. New York: Teacher College.
Millard, R.M. (1983). The accrediting association: Ensuring the quality of programs and institutions. Change, 15(14), 32-36.

Mortimer, K.P., & Tierney, M.L. (1979). The three "r's" of the eighties: Reduction, reallocation and retrenchment (Report No. 4). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1984). A nation at risk - the full account. Cambridge: Murray Printing.

Pace, C.R. (1985). Perspectives and problems in student outcomes research. In P.T. Ewell (Ed.), Assessing educational outcomes (pp. 7-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Parker, F.J. (1980). Home economics: An introduction to a dynamic profession (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Parker, F.J. (1987). Home economics: An introduction to a dynamic profession (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan

Rossi, P.H., & Freeman, H.E. (1982). Evaluation a systematic approach (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Stadtman, V.A. (1980). Academic adaptations - higher education prepares for the 1980's and 1990's. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.

Weis, S., East, M., & Manning, S. (1974). Home economics units in higher education: A decade of change. Journal of Home Economics, 5, 11-15.

Weiss, D.J., Davis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). Manual for the minnesota satisfaction questionnaire, minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation XXII. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Whipple, T.W., & Muffo, J.A. (1982). Adjusting for non response bias: The case of an alumni survey. Denver: Association for Institutional Research. Paper presented at 22nd Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research.

Wise, S.L., Hengstler, D.D., & Braskamp, L.A. (1981). Alumni ratings as an indicator of departmental quality. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73(1), 71-77.

Wolf, R.M. (1984). Evaluation in education: Foundations of competency assessment and program review. New York: Praeger.

Woods, V.M. (1983). The value of home economics curricula in higher education as perceived by graduates. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. West Lafayette: Purdue University.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

Follow-up of B.S. Graduates in the
College of Home Economics,
Oklahoma State University

_____
code

Part I. Demographic Data

Directions Place an X in the space before the numbered response that is correct for you in items 1 and 2, and place the number of children you have in the different age categories in item 3.

1. My ethnic group is

___ a. American Indian
___ b. Asian
___ c. Asian American
___ d. Black American
___ e. Caucasian
___ f. Spanish origin or Hispanic
___ g. Other (specify) _____

2. My current marital status is

___ a. Divorced
___ b. Married
___ c. Never married
___ d. Separated
___ e. Widowed

3. The number of children I have is

___ a. Under 1 year
___ b. From 1-5 years
___ c. From 6-10 years
___ d. From 11-15 years
___ e. From 16-20 years
___ f. No children

Part II. Employment Data

Directions When multiple choices are given in an item, place an X in the blank before the choice that is correct for you. In other items, please write or type the information requested.

4. My current employment status is

___ a. Employed full-time (40 hours or more per week)
___ b. Employed part-time (less than 40 hours per week)
___ c. Homemaker
___ d. Self-employed
___ e. Not employed
___ f. Other (specify) _____

*a) If you have never been employed, proceed to item 19-20.
b) If you are presently not employed, proceed to item 21-23.
c) If employed, proceed to next items.

over

5. My current employment is

   a. Job title _____
   (For example, Marketing Representative, Restaurant Manager, Secondary Home Economics Teacher, etc.)

   b. Employer _____
   (Name of institution, company, agency, etc.)

   c. Address _____
   (City) (State/Zip)

6. The number of months employed per year is

   ____ a. Less than 9 months
   ____ b. 9 or 10 months
   ____ c. 12 months
   ____ d. Other (specify) _____

7. My annual salary is

   ____ a. Less than $10,000
   ____ b. Less than $15,000
   ____ c. Less than $20,000
   ____ d. Less than $25,000
   ____ e. $25,000 or more

8-9. The major responsibility of my current position is (check only one)

   ____ a. Buying/Merchandising
   ____ b. Communications (radio, television, publications)
   ____ c. Designing/Drafting
   ____ d. Executive training/Management training
   ____ e. Food service delivery/Service
   ____ f. Health care delivery/Service
   ____ g. Management
   ____ h. Marketing/Sales
   ____ i. Product development/Testing
   ____ j. Research
   ____ k. Teaching (formal or informal groups)
   ____ l. Other (specify) _____

10. The category which best describes my current employer is (check only one)

   ____ a. Business/Industry
   ____ b. Cooperative extension
   ____ c. Four-year college/University
   ____ d. Government (city, state, or federal)
   ____ e. Non-profit organization
   ____ f. Public/Private educational school system (K through 12th grades)
   ____ g. Two-year college/Technical institute
   ____ h. Other (specify) _____

11-12. The most important reason for my accepting this current position is (check only one)

____ a. Convenient work hours
____ b. Geographical location
____ c. Individually challenging and/or rewarding work
____ d. Only job offer
____ e. Opportunities for advancement
____ f. Prefer outside employment to homemaking responsibilities
____ g. Salary and fringe benefits
____ h. Sole provider for self or self and dependents
____ i. Supplement family income
____ j. To follow spouse
____ k. Other (specify) _____

13. The best source of information used to obtain my current employment is (check only one)

____ a. Commercial employment agency
____ b. Friend or relative
____ c. Government register (city, state, or federal)
____ d. Job announcement from personnel department
____ e. Newspaper want ads
____ f. Promotion from within organization
____ g. University Placement Office
____ h. Other (specify) _____

14. The length of time employed in my present position is

____ a. Less than a year
____ b. From 1-2 years
____ c. From 2-3 years
____ d. From 3-4 years
____ e. From 4-5 years

15-16. Some of you have had other positions (full-time or part-time) since graduation. Please complete the form included here. My major responsibilities in other employment were

		17. Year(s) Employed	18. Job Title
____	a. Buying/Merchandising	_____	_____
____	b. Communications	_____	_____
____	c. Counseling/Advising	_____	_____
____	d. Designing/Drafting	_____	_____
____	e. Executive training/ Management training	_____	_____
____	f. Food service delivery/Service	_____	_____
____	g. Health care delivery/Service	_____	_____
____	h. Management	_____	_____
____	i. Marketing/Sales	_____	_____
____	j. Product development/ Testing	_____	_____
____	k. Research	_____	_____
____	l. Teaching (informal and informal groups)	_____	_____
____	m. Other (specify) _____	_____	_____

over

Please proceed to Part III and complete the rest of the instrument.

19-20. The most important reason for my not being employed is (check only one)

____ a. Cannot work hours required
____ b. Full-time student
____ c. Health disorder
____ d. Lost interest in profession
____ e. No position available
____ f. No suitable arrangements for care of child(ren)
____ g. No suitable transportation
____ h. Not interested in working outside the home
____ i. Out of labor force for several years
____ j. Part-time student
____ k. Salary not worthwhile
____ l. Spouse prefers I do not work outside the home
____ m. Other (specify) _____

Please complete the rest of the instrument.

Part III. Professional Preparation Data

Directions Please complete the form by writing in the blanks that apply for you.

My educational experiences since receiving the B.S. in Home Economics are

	Institution (Do not Abbreviate)	Degree Earned or Expected	Date of Completion (Mon/Year)	Dept. & Major Area(s) of Study	Minor Area(s) of Study (if any)
21.					
22.					
23.					

Directions Place an X in the appropriate column blank to indicate your feelings on each of the following statements. If never employed please omit items 24-37.

My undergraduate program has contributed to my personal/professional development in the following areas.

Areas	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Employment					
24. Selection of my professional area of employment					
25. Basic abilities and skills in my professional area of employment					
26. Basic training for current position					
27. Relationships with employer and co-workers					
PROFESSIONAL/PERSONAL					
28. Relationships with family members and others					
29. Ability to organize and manage					
30. A workable philosophy of life					
31. Self-concept and self-confidence					
32. Flexibility in meeting and changing situations					
33. Ability to make decisions					
34. Ability to think and act upon convictions					
35. Ability to assume leadership role and responsibilities					
36. Preparation for marriage and/or family life					
37. Preparation for work on advanced degree					

over

Part IV. Involvement Data

Directions Complete the information requested in the space provided and when the items give you a choice, place an X in the blank(s) that are true for you.

38-48. My involvement in organizations since graduation includes the following.

Organizations	Major Leadership Positions Assumed
a. None	
b. Political	
c. Religious	
d. Service	
e. Social	
f. Other (specify)	

44-58. My memberships in professional organizations include (check all that apply)

____ a. American Association of Housing Educators
____ b. American Council on Consumer Interests
____ c. American Dietetic Association
____ d. American Home Economics Association
____ e. American Hotel and Motel Association
____ f. American Society of Interior Designers
____ g. American Vocational Association
____ h. Association of School Food Service Personnel
____ i. Club Managers Association of America
____ j. Association of School Food Service Personnel
____ k. National Association for the Education of Young Children
____ l. National Council on Family Relations
____ m. National Education Association
____ n. National Restaurant Association
____ o. Other (specify)
_____

59-60. The offices held and/or the major committee responsibilities in these national professional organizations since graduation from OSU include

_____

_____

61. The professional meetings and/or continuing education activities attended in the last 24 months include

_____

_____

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

(short-form)

Vocational Psychology Research

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell **how you feel about your present job,** what things you are **satisfied** with and what things you are **not satisfied** with.

On the basis of your answers and those of people like you, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people **like and dislike about their jobs.**

On the next page you will find statements about your **present** job.

- Read each statement carefully.
- Decide **how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job** described by the statement.

  Keeping the statement in mind:

  —if you feel that your job gives you **more than you expected,** check the box under **"Very Sat."** (Very Satisfied);

  —if you feel that your job gives you **what you expected,** check the box under **"Sat."** (Satisfied);

  —if you **cannot make up your mind** whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under **"N"** (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);

  —if you feel that your job gives you **less than you expected,** check the box under **"Dissat."** (Dissatisfied);

  —if you feel that your job gives you **much less than you expected,** check the box under **"Very Dissat."** (Very Dissatisfied).

- Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding **how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job.**
- Do this for **all** statements. Please answer **every** item.

Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your **present job.**

*Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?*

***Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.*

***Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.*

***N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.*

***Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.*

***Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.*

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
1. Being able to keep busy all the time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. The chance to work alone on the job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. The chance to do different things from time to time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. The way my job provides for steady employment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. The chance to do things for other people	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. The chance to tell people what to do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. The way company policies are put into practice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. My pay and the amount of work I do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. The chances for advancement on this job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. The freedom to use my own judgment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. The working conditions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. The praise I get for doing a good job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

Name_____ Today's Date_____ 19____
Please Print

1. Check one: ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. When were you born?_____ 19____

3. Circle the number of years of schooling you completed:

4 5 6 7 8	9 10 11 12	13 14 15 16	17 18 19 20
Grade School	High School	College	Graduate or Professional School

4. What is your present job called? _____

_____

5. What do you do on your present job? _____

_____

_____

6. How long have you been on your present job?_____years _____months

7. What would you call your **occupation,** your usual line of work? _____

_____

8. How long have you been in this line of work? _____years _____months

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE

Oklahoma State University

COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
HOME ECONOMICS WEST
(405) 624-5053

May 9, 1986

Dear Graduate:

The College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University is conducting a follow-up study of B.S. graduates, 1980-84. A random sample of graduates was selected for this study; your name was selected, and we need your help.

There are two instruments to complete. The one developed by us is to bring us up-to-date on your professional life and personal life. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire reveals how satisfied you are with the work you do. If you have worked since graduation from college, please complete both forms. We thank you for the 30 minutes it takes to complete the forms.

There is a stamped and addressed envelope for returning the completed forms. When we receive your forms, your name and address will be removed from the list. This is to protect your right for personal privacy. There will be a follow-up of non-participants.

We really appreciate your help. If you have any questions, contact Anna M. Gorman at (405) 624-5047.

Sincerely yours,

Beverly Crabtree, Dean
College of Home Economics

Sincerely yours,

Anna M. Gorman

Anna M. Gorman, Professor
Home Economics Education & Community Services

/dd
enclosures
cc

CENTENNIAL DECADE
1980 • 1990

Oklahoma State University
COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
HOME ECONOMICS WEST
(405) 624-5053

June 23, 1986

Dear Graduate:

We have failed to receive the follow-up of B.S. graduates in the College of Home Economics, Oklahoma State University completed forms from you. We are enclosing the two forms in this communication with you in the hope that you will have the time to complete the forms.

Thank you for assisting us in the follow-up study.

Sincerely yours,

Beverly Crabtree, Dean
College of Home Economics

Sincerely yours,

Anna M. Gorman, Professor
Home Economics Education & Community Services

/dd
enclosures
cc

CENTENNIAL DECADE
1980 • 1990

APPENDIX C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR "OTHER" CATEGORIES NOT SPECIFIED IN REPORT

TABLE XIX

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR "OTHER" MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY OF CURRENT POSITION

Major Responsibility	Frequency
Counseling	8
Insurance	4
Accounting	4
Secretarial	5
Real Estate	2
Computer Programmer	1
Child Care	2
Nursing	2
Analyst	1
Catering	1
Typesetting	1

TABLE XX

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF "OTHER"
DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT EMPLOYER

Employer	Frequency
Medical-Health Care/Private	3
Real Estate	2
For Profit Organization	2
Private Organization with State Contract	1

TABLE XXI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF "OTHER" REASONS FOR ACCEPTING CURRENT POSITION

Reason	Frequency
Best available position	2
Retail experience needed	1
First job offer	1
Personal development	1
Temporary while working on another venture	1
Combination of reasons	1

TABLE XXII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF "OTHER" SOURCES USED TO OBTAIN CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

Source	Frequency
Walked or called in	12
Self referral	5
Professional journal	1
Previous employee	4
Substituted then moved into full-time position	1
ROTC	1
Seeking different position	1
Asked school to add program	1

VITA

Ramona Bryant Kellam

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND JOB SATISFACTION: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Major Field: Home Economics Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, October 13, 1951, the daughter of Aaron and Jestina Bryant.

Education: Graduated from Douglass High School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, in May, 1969; received Bachelor of Science degree in Vocational Home Economics Education from Langston University in May, 1973; received Master of Science degree from the University of Wisconsin-Stout in Clothing, Textiles and Related Art in August, 1974; received candidacy for Doctor of Philosophy degree in Vocational Education, in July, 1978, Indiana University; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1987, in Home Economics Education.

Professional Experience: Graduate Assistant, School of Home Economics, University of Wisconsin-Stout, September, 1973, to August, 1974; Family Living Specialist, Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service-1890 Program, Langston University, August, 1974, to August, 1975; Area Program Agent-Home Economics, Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service-1890 Program, Langston University, August, 1975, to August, 1976; Graduate Assistant, Department of Vocational Education, Indiana University, August, 1976, to May 1978; Research Assistant, Department of Home Economics, Indiana

University, August, 1978, to July, 1979; Instructor-Chairperson, Department of Home Economics, Langston University, September, 1982, to present.

Professional Organizations: American Home Economics Association; Oklahoma Home Economics Association.