

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE PERCEPTIONS
OF THE SOCIAL STATUS OF CAREERS
BY COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

ARTHUR JOHN CLARK

Bachelor of Arts
Eastern Nazarene College
Quincy, Massachusetts
1966

Master of Education
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
1970

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1974

Thesis
1974D
C592i
Cop. 2

MAR 13 1975 MAR 13 1975 MA

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE PERCEPTIONS
OF THE SOCIAL STATUS OF CAREERS
BY COLLEGE STUDENTS

Thesis Approved: Thesis Approved: Thesis Approved:

John M. ...
Thesis Adviser

Donald A. Tennant
Frank K. Probst
Jude ... elton
D. D. ...
Dean of the Graduate College

902050 902050 902050

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to Dr. James Seals for his sound guidance and encouragement as my major advisor. I want to thank the other members of my advisory committee, Dr. Harry Brobst, Dr. Judy Shelton, and Dr. Donald Tennant, for their able assistance.

Additionally, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. W. P. Ewens for his interest and understanding during the period that I wrote this thesis and worked for him as a graduate assistant.

Credit should be extended to the Administrative Services and the Computer Center staff members at the Oklahoma State University. The former facilitated the identification of the survey respondents who participated in the study, and the latter assisted in analyzing the data collected from the respondents.

The writer also thanks Mrs. Kay Mayes for typing the final copy of this thesis.

Finally, special appreciation is offered to my wife, Marybeth, for her patience and sacrifice during the completion of this task.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Hypotheses	3
Questions	4
Significance of the Study	4
Definition of Terms	5
Assumptions of the Study	6
Limitations of the Study	6
Organization of the Study	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Introduction	9
The Nature of Occupational Social Status	9
Empirical Studies of Occupational Social Status	14
Vocational Counseling Implications of Occupational Social Status	21
Summary	29
III. METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN	32
Introduction	32
Procedure and Sample Selection	32
The Survey	34
Statistical Treatment	38
Summary	43
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS	44
Introduction	44
The Response to the Survey	45
Occupational Social Status and the Student Variables	49
Occupational Ego-Centrism	67
Occupational Awareness	71
Summary	77
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	79
General Summary of the Investigation	79
Findings and Conclusions	80

Chapter	Page
Implications	86
Concluding Summary	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY	91
APPENDIX A - THE SURVEY USED IN THIS STUDY	96
APPENDIX B - COVER LETTER TO THE SURVEY USED IN THIS STUDY	101
APPENDIX C - OCCUPATIONS LISTED IN THE CONTENTS OF THE <u>OCCUPATIONAL OUTLOOK FOR COLLEGE GRADUATES</u>	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Total Ranking of Occupations	46
II. Totals of Occupation Ratings	50
III. Correlations Between Occupation Ranks Among Colleges . . .	53
IV. Ranking of Occupations by College	55
V. Correlations Between Occupation Ranks Among Classes . . .	59
VI. Ranking of Occupations by Class Level	60
VII. Correlations Between Occupation Ranks by Grade Point Average Among Classes	63
VIII. Ranking of Occupations by Male and Female Students	65
IX. Occupations Rated by Students Preparing to Work In Specific Careers	69
X. Ranking of Selected Occupations Associated With a College	70
XI. Occupational Choices of the Survey Respondents	72
XII. Occupations Rated "Not Familiar" by More Than Five Percent of the Sample	74
XIII. Extreme Standard Deviations of Rated Occupations	76

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Study

Many factors are involved when a person makes a career choice, including how other people perceive the status of occupations. Part of the assessment process that may be given to a career selection is the consideration of the esteem or regard that occupations are accorded by society. The importance that a person places on the social status of careers may be assessed within the work value of prestige.

The work value of prestige is not widely recognized and an individual may need vocational guidance in understanding the significance of the value. Career information may also be needed that provides data on how other people perceive the social status of occupations. The career counselor, with an understanding of the social status of careers and with information on how careers are regarded by society, is in an excellent position to assist a person in assessing the work value of prestige.

Career counseling is offered to help people make wise vocational choices and counseling may be necessary at different stages of the vocational development of individuals. At the college and university level, career counseling may be useful in sorting out the myriad of career possibilities that are open to college graduates. Part of the sorting out process should include the assessment of the work value of

prestige and the complementary career information on the social status of careers.

One of the objectives of this study was to investigate the perceptions of the social status of careers by college students. A comprehensive review of previous studies relevant to the social status of occupations was completed in order to provide a more complete understanding of the role of status in the career decision-making process.

There have been many attempts to have occupations rated by social status (Dolliver, 1967). Most of the investigations involved sampling occupations from different strata levels. Representative careers were chosen from unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, semiprofessional and small business, and managerial and professional levels, and people were asked to rate them by some measure of social status.

This study investigated, in depth, a segment of the broad range of occupations. Careers for college graduates were evaluated for social status by college students. This procedure allowed for a manageable area of occupations to be investigated and it provided for a respondent group that had a relationship with the occupations that were analyzed.

Braun and Bayer (1973) completed a study that considered the variables of age, ethnic, and sex differences among college students, in ranking, by social status, twenty-five occupations from varied types of work. Although the variables allowed for a comprehensive interpretation of the data collected, the limited number and the broad range of occupations considered makes it difficult to analyze the data in terms of application. In addition, the majority of the occupations that were evaluated were unlikely possibilities as careers for college graduates.

Stephens, Stevens, and Arnold (1967) had over one thousand students from eighteen colleges, in various geographical regions in the United States, rank order twenty professional careers in terms of prestige. The professional careers were possible occupational choices of the college students, but the number of careers evaluated was not large enough to be considered representative of careers for college graduates. In addition, their study differentiated the results of the vocational prestige rankings on only one variable, the major subject of the respondents. A significant part of the present study was to evaluate how careers for college graduates are rated when multiple student variables are considered.

Statement of the Problem

This investigation proposed to clarify the social status of careers for college graduates as perceived by college students. More specifically, the study was designed to assess how careers for college graduates are ranked in terms of social status by college students, when their college, class, grade point average, and sex varies. In addition, the present study was concerned with student awareness of the preparation programs and general occupational perceptions of the social status of each career.

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by students from the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Home Economics, and the School of Technology.

2. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior students.

3. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by students with high and low grade point averages in each class.

4. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by male and female students.

Questions

The following questions, although they are derived from the statement of the problem, were considered separately from the hypotheses. The means of assessing the questions were not appropriate for hypotheses testing and related tests of significance.

1. Do individuals give a higher social status rating, on the average, to occupations that they are preparing to work in?

2. Do individuals give a higher social status rating, on the average, to occupations that are related to the occupation that they are preparing to work in?

3. What is the level of awareness of college students of the social status of careers for college graduates?

Significance of the Study

The results of this study should provide useful career information that may be used by counselors and students at the college and university level. The results of the investigation will also produce new knowledge and thus broaden the career perspectives of the counselor and

the students that he serves. With the expanded awareness of the social status of occupations, the counselor should be in a position to better understand the social forces that enter into the career decision-making process of students. The student should be able to assess more objectively his status needs by observing how other students evaluate occupations for college graduates. In the counseling relationship, the information may lead to value clarification and the establishment of career goals.

In a publication on career information, Isaacson (1966) suggested the importance of considering the social status of occupations in vocational counseling:

The entire emphasis on prestige ratings, by their very nature and content, is sociological in nature -- showing how other people, the public in general, think of a particular occupation. One of the positions advocated in this volume is that the psychological and sociological impact of the occupation upon the job holder is a crucial part of career information. One way of helping young people to become aware of such factors is to consider with them the consistency, over fairly long periods, of public attitudes toward selected occupations. Besides broadening the perspective with which youth looks at jobs, prestige ratings may help some people to develop motivation to work toward goals which they previously had considered only casually. (Isaacson, 1966, p. 53)

This study is an effort to further refine the information that is available on the social status of occupations so that more effective career counseling may take place.

Definition of Terms

The definitions below are stated for the purpose of clarifying how the terms are used throughout this study.

Occupation. The type of work that a person engages in, usually on a full-time basis, for an extended period of time.

Career. A series or a sequence of occupations that a person is employed in over the course of a lifetime. In common usage, and as it is used in this study, the term is interchangeable with "occupation."

Occupational social status. How an occupation is perceived regarding its relationship with other occupations, in terms of prestige or social status.

Occupational ego-centrism. The possibility that people rate the occupation in which they are preparing for employment or are already employed, higher in status than those individuals not vocationally associated with the occupation.

Grade point average. (GPA), is the cumulative average of the grades of a college student. In this study, the 4.0 system employed at the Oklahoma State University was utilized.

College graduate. A degree recipient from an institution of higher education at the baccalaureate or more advanced level.

Assumptions of the Study

1. It is assumed that the college student respondents of the survey employed in this study are able to make a theoretical judgment of the social status ratings of careers for college students.
2. Another assumption is that the ninety-four careers rated in the survey presents a broad range of occupations that college graduates enter so that they may be considered representative of careers for college graduates.

Limitations of the Study

1. The subjects participating in the study were students from six undergraduate colleges and the School of Technology at the Oklahoma

State University. Caution should be used if generalizations about the findings are made to groups that differ in size, college, or in other significant ways from the groups sampled.

2. For some careers it is difficult to define standardized responsibilities and duties and this may produce a broad range of responses when the occupation is given a status rating. As an example, a bank officer may be employed in different positions from a manager of a small rural bank to the president of an international banking concern. The status rating of a banker may depend upon a person's perception of the relative position that bank officers hold in terms of responsibilities.

3. Some careers are not as widely known as others and students may not have enough familiarity with them to state a status rating. A category on the survey sheet used in this study allowed for the selection of "not familiar" when an evaluation could not be made.

4. Only careers for college graduates, degree recipients at the baccalaureate level and above, were assessed in this study. Careers for graduates from junior and community colleges were not evaluated because the design of the study prohibited the investigation of areas that may have confounded the results.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I has included an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the hypotheses, the significance of the study, the definitions of terms, and the assumptions and limitations of the study.

Chapter II will review the literature in the nature of occupational social status and related research studies. In addition, a section

will be given to the vocational counseling implications of occupational social status.

Chapter III will present the methodology and design of the study including a description of the survey used, the sample selection of student respondents, and the statistical treatment that will be utilized to analyze the data.

Chapter IV will provide a statistical analysis of the data collected and the validity of the hypotheses will be considered. It will also contain a discussion of the results of this study.

Chapter V will include the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature of occupational social status from three points of interest. First, the nature of occupational social status is reviewed. This section deals with describing the substance and the social influence of occupational prestige. It provides support for the theoretical nature of the status dimension in occupations, upon which this study is based.

Empirical studies of occupational social status are then reviewed. Since early in this century investigations have been conducted in assessing how people rate occupations for status. The review of the studies provides a historical perspective for the present research. Vocational implications of occupational social status will be considered last.

The Nature of Occupational Social Status

An occupational social status hierarchy develops when some types of work are perceived as being more prestigious than others. When individuals are asked to evaluate the status of a group of occupations, by rating them or by placing them in a rank order, they are usually able to provide evaluative responses. As noted by Cattell (1942), the social status of occupations is possible to define and measure in terms of inventoried responses. He stated that: "The prestige of an occupation is

resident in the minds of all people in the community and is to be measured by assessing their attitudes toward it at a given time" (1942, p. 300).

A common methodology has emerged from the studies that have evaluated the social status of occupations. Most often, individuals have been asked to rank order a small number, usually between twenty and thirty, of occupations according to prestige, status or some similar dimension. In observing the consistency of the measurable results of such surveys, Herrnstein (1973) stated that:

When social scientists ask ordinary people to rate 'esteem' or 'social status' or 'prestige' of various occupations, the answers usually come quickly and confidently -- a clear sign of a genuine subjective scale. (1973, p. 25)

If people are able to make subjective ratings of the social status of occupations then some careers are perceived as being higher in prestige, and perhaps more desirable, than others. It is likely though that the prestige of careers is a concept that is not often considered by most people. Unless an individual is familiar with the empirical studies that have been completed in the area of the social status of occupations then the measurement of the prestige of occupations may be a novel concept. However, although the degree of concern about occupational prestige is difficult to assess, the substantiation that the prestige of occupations is possible to measure suggests that some attention is given to the status of occupations in our society.

Thomas (1956) wrote about the role of occupational social status among people in the United States:

A profound concern for prestige, respectability, proper appearances, and 'face saving' is one of the basic traits, not only of our culture, but of most cultures, and it is hardly surprising to find this concern expressed in comparative judgments of occupations. (1956, p. 173)

Super (1957) stated that the social status of a person is principally determined by his occupation. The work that an individual does provides a significant amount of information about him. It often suggests his salary range; the amount of education that he has completed; the degree of responsibility that he has on his job; and the working conditions at his place of employment. Haller and Portes (1973) supported the possibility that the career of an individual is: ". . . the most representative summary measure of a person's general social standing within the context of modern societies" (1973, p. 54).

The occupation of an individual has social consequences that affect his personal life. The salary and the type of position that a person has may contribute to the selection of the community, and more specifically, the neighborhood in the community, in which he lives. This, in turn, establishes his neighbors who often become friends. The friends have certain activities that they engage in and recreation may be taken with them. Other friendships are often made among the people that a person works with.

If the social status of a person is principally determined by his occupation, and the income of an individual comes from his career, then it may be assumed that income is a contributing factor to the prestige of occupations. This should produce a high correlation between income and occupational social status. Folsom and Sobolewski (1957) completed a study that had high school students rank order twenty-six occupations in terms of prestige and yearly income. The rho coefficient between the rankings of the social status of the occupations and the estimated yearly income was 0.74 for the sophomore group surveyed and for the seniors, the rho was 0.64 (1957, p. 277).

Income does not always correlate exactly with occupational prestige ratings, however. In the research studies completed some careers that pay less than others are rated above the higher salaried positions (Reiss, 1961). As an example, the teaching professions are usually rated above the skilled crafts, but the latter often have higher incomes than teachers. This suggests that other factors contribute to the substance of occupational social status.

Intelligence and the social status of occupations was studied by Canter (1956). He had civilian occupations of United States Army enlisted personnel ranked according to their Army General Classification Test scores. The results were correlated with rankings of the same occupations from five studies of occupational prestige. The rho coefficients averaged about 0.92 and Canter concluded that: ". . . judges perceptions of intelligence of personnel in occupational groups may be a dominant factor leading to the judgments of social status of occupations" (1956, p. 259).

Other investigations have considered more than one factor that may contribute to the substance of occupational social status. Caplow (1954) believed that there are eight attributes that determine the composition of occupational prestige: responsibility, nature of the work, formal education, training, authority, class attributes, income, and behavior control. Behavior control was thought to correlate best with the rank order of prestige rankings of occupations. Caplow defined behavior control as:

the status of the individual in the typical situations elicited by his occupational role, vis-à-vis his clients, customers, subordinates, superiors, pupils, passengers, or indeed whatever other persons he normally meets in the course of his occupational duties. (1954, p. 55)

In a later study, Stefflre (1959) attempted to define occupational prestige in terms of choice, status, altruism, control, education, job freedom, intelligence, money, security, and self-realization. He was unable to differentiate the relative weights of the elements employing factor analysis. Simpson and Simpson (1960) used regression analysis and they found that training-education-skill and responsibility, in conjunction, accounted for much of the variance in the prestige of occupations.

Thomas (1962) succinctly defined occupational social status along five dimensions:

Power dimension. An occupation which represents greater power or control over larger numbers of people or over sources of greater wealth is accorded higher prestige than occupations which represent less power or control.

Financial-reward dimension. An occupation which yields higher financial rewards is accorded higher prestige than one yielding lower rewards.

Crucial-role dimension. An occupation which figures crucially in an individual's life at times of crisis (the physician at times of illness, the lawyer when a person is threatened with prison) is more prestigious than occupations that seldom or never play crucial roles.

Education dimension. An occupation which demands more formal education will be accorded higher prestige than one which demands little education or training.

Mental-physical dimension. An occupation which involves primarily mental-verbal activities is more prestigious than one involving physical work. (This might be labeled a white-collar and blue-collar dimension.)

Service-to-society dimension. An occupation which contributes more to the society's pursuit of its ideals is more prestigious than one that contributes less. (1962, p. 565)

Each of the occupational prestige dimensions suggested by Thomas (1962) is investigated in at least one of the other five previously mentioned studies that considered the substance of occupational social

status. Education (formal, including training) received the most attention as a possible contributor to the composition of occupational prestige. Financial-reward (or income), crucial-role (or responsibility), and power (or authority) were evaluated in the majority of the inquiries.

The mental-physical dimension was studied in two other investigations although it was more broadly defined under the factor of "intelligence." The service-to-society dimension was evaluated under the topic of "altruism" in one of the other studies. Factors that were analyzed by only one researcher, which may suggest a lesser significance, are: nature of the work, job freedom, security, self-realization, and behavior control. In addition, the factor of social status was considered in one study but it could not be differentiated from occupational social status, which was being evaluated.

It is evident that occupational social status cannot be measured in terms of one factor, such as income. There are several, if not many factors, that may contribute to the prestige of occupations. The dominant contributing factors seem to be: income, authority, responsibility, and education. A comprehensive research study into the substance of occupational prestige would assist in identifying with more substantiation, the factors that contribute to the social status of occupations.

Empirical Studies of Occupational Social Status

The first empirical study of the social status of occupations is attributed to George Counts (1925). He was concerned with the status of the teaching profession and he wanted to:

. . . direct attention toward an important problem in vocational guidance which is seldom squarely faced. In all that

has been written on occupations, there is a tendency to disregard the fundamental question of social status. (1925, p. 16)

Forty-five occupations were presented to be put in a rank order by a group of high school and college students and teachers. A ranking of the occupations was derived from the median ranks of each occupation by the student and teacher groups. The coefficients of correlation between the groups were all above 0.90 (1925, p. 19).

The study by Counts (1925) established a precedent for many other subsequent investigations of occupational social status. The methodology of having groups of people, usually students, rank order careers by prestige and then correlating the results, has been employed in numerous other later studies. Subsequent research broadened his original treatment but it maintained his primary purpose, to direct attention to the influence of social status in career decision-making.

Investigating the stability of occupational social status over a period of time became one of the means that broadened the work of Counts. Neitz (1935) found occupational prestige perceptions highly stable over a six-year period for high school seniors. Deeg and Patterson (1947) asked 475 high school college students to rank order twenty-five of the forty-five occupations that were evaluated in the study by Counts. A rho coefficient of 0.97 was obtained and the researchers stated: "In general we are forced to conclude that the social status of occupations has changed very little in the United States during the past 21 years" (1947, p. 207). Tuckman (1947), in a study completed in Canada, supported Deeg and Patterson's results.

Hakel, Hollmann, and Dunnette (1968) duplicated the Deeg and Patterson survey, including related occupations from the study by Counts.

They found a high degree of stability of occupational prestige over a forty-two year period. Relative changes were noted in the rank order of some occupations, however. Carpenters, electricians, and plumbers (the skilled crafts) all had considerable gains in prestige. Grocers, farmers, and mail carriers were rated much lower in status rankings.

Assessing people from various socioeconomic backgrounds emerged as an area of interest to researchers of occupational social status. Cattell (1942) had twenty-six occupations ranked by college graduates and by skilled and unskilled laborers. A correlation coefficient of 0.94 for the ranking between the student and laborer groups was reported. In Great Britain Hall and Jones (1950) surveyed over 1,000 adults from various socioeconomic backgrounds and had them rank thirty occupations for social status. They found a consensus for a stable occupational prestige hierarchy among the people sampled.

One student and five occupational sub-groups were among the 490 subjects surveyed by Garbin (1967) when he had thirty occupations ranked for prestige. The rank-order correlations among the six sub-groups were found to be 0.90 or above. Garbin attributed mass communication, the public school system, and indirect interaction with certain occupational practitioners as being contributing factors to the uniformity of occupational social status perceptions among different groups of people.

Sampling a large number of people in order to ascertain a national consensus of occupational prestige ratings has been the concern of two significant studies. The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) interviewed 2,930 people from various regions in the United States on the subject of the social status of occupations (North and Hatt, 1949). This survey, completed in 1946 and reported in the Opinion News (1947),

is perhaps the most well-known of the studies of occupational prestige. In recent years it has most frequently been referred to as the North-Hatt or the NORC study.

In the NORC study a list of ninety occupations were rated on the basis of a five category scale ranging from low to high. The interviewer asked the respondent to rate the occupations in one of the five categories. The categories were transformed into a quantitative scale and a rank order of the occupations was developed from the average ratings for each occupation. Supreme Court Justice was given the highest rating by the people surveyed across the country. Physician and state governor tied for second place and shoe shiner, street sweeper and garbage collector were rated lowest in the survey by the public. Hatt (1950) provided an analysis of the survey in an article and Reiss, et al. (1961) used the results of the investigation to develop a plan for classifying occupations.

The NORC study was replicated in 1963 when Hodge, Siegel, and Rossi (1966) surveyed 651 people from selected regions across the United States. Although their sample of respondents was smaller than in the NORC study, a product-moment correlation of 0.99 between the two studies was reported. Several reasons for the high stability of occupational social status between the two investigations, and other studies in the prestige of occupations, were suggested by the researchers: the educational and functional requirements of an occupation; the importance of an occupation to society; and the income of an occupation do not change rapidly. Some mild changes were noted, however, between the two surveys that were completed sixteen years apart. Scientific careers increased

slightly in status; culturally oriented occupations decreased somewhat; and the prestige of artisans went up.

Geographic stability of occupational social status has been considered in some studies that have compared the prestige ratings of occupations that had been surveyed in different nations. Inkeles and Rossi (1956) found a high correlation among subject responses from the Soviet Union, Japan, Great Britain, New Zealand, and the United States in a comparison of previously conducted research investigations. Kunde and Dawis (1959) found a high degree of geographic stability among the social status rankings of twenty-three occupations in Germany, the United States, and the Philippines. All of the rho inter-correlations, ranked by high school students in each country, were above 0.90.

Twenty Indonesian occupations were ranked by Indonesian high school students and compared with twenty identical or very similar occupations that were rated in the NORC study. The investigation completed by Thomas and Soeparman (1963) resulted in a rho correlation of 0.95 between the Indonesian and American social status rankings of the occupations. The high correlation between the two nations, one highly industrialized and one at an early level of industrialization, supports the geographic stability of the social status of occupations.

The NORC study evaluated ninety occupations for social status. Most other empirical studies in occupational prestige had subjects evaluate far fewer occupations, generally between twenty and thirty (Davies, 1952). This came about mainly because it is less difficult administratively to have people rank order a small, rather than a large, number of occupations. There have been several attempts, however, to have large numbers of occupations rated for prestige. Smith (1943) had one

hundred occupations rated on a scale from one to one hundred by high school and college students. Eventually he wanted to enlarge the scale so that all occupations could be ranked for social status. Another effort to rank order a large number of occupations was made by Hall (1938) when he had 200 adults arrange 252 occupations in a prestige hierarchy. Stubbins (1950) had five psychologists and two bookkeepers establish a rank order for 462 occupations. None of the studies resulted in an empirical scale and no further use of the ranked occupations was reported by the researchers.

The majority of the empirical studies of occupational prestige have not differentiated between male and female occupations, although there have been several studies that have focused on the social status of careers for women. Menger (1932) had 704 students and adults rank order thirty-five occupations following the format established by Counts. Her purpose was to determine the social standing of occupations that were popular career choices for women. She found that the occupations ranked produced a social status hierarchy of careers for women. In a similar study, Stevens (1940) had women college students rank order twenty-five occupations in order to assess the perceptions of college women towards careers that most often employed females. Again a hierarchy of careers for women, rated for social status, was established.

Stefflre, Resnikoff, and Lezotte (1968) found that the prestige of occupations does not vary with the sex of the worker. They were concerned with the possibility that the status rating of an occupation changes depending upon the sex of the person holding the position. The statistical results of the study indicated that the allocation of occupational social status is not dependent upon the position being held by

a male or a female. The researchers, however, questioned the validity of their findings and they suggested that further inquiry into the relationship of sex to occupational prestige should be continued.

Another investigation into the social status of occupations for women was completed by Baudler and Patterson (1948) when they enlisted 763 high school and college students to rank order twenty-nine occupations typically filled by women. They found that the occupations had a rho coefficient of 0.98 between the male and female respondents to the survey. Like most other studies in occupational prestige, they found that the professional occupations, or those that require long periods of training or experience, were ranked high. Occupations that were unskilled or semiskilled, requiring little experience or training, were ranked low.

The National Opinion Research Center (North and Hatt, 1949) survey found that men and women rated the relative standing of occupations very close. However, slightly higher scores, on the average, were given to almost every type of work. Some types of occupations were given "markedly higher" evaluations by women: educational and social welfare work; vocations associated with the arts; religious work; and protective and personal service jobs. The survey also revealed little difference in the percentage of men and women who were unable to rate an occupation due to a lack of familiarity with it.

In another study that considered sex differences in occupational prestige ratings, Simmons (1962) had students in the fourth, eighth, and twelfth-grade rate twenty occupations for prestige and interest. Correlation results suggested that males, as early as the fourth-grade, had highly significant awareness of occupational social status; girls did

not display the same awareness until grade eight. The present study considered how college men and women rate occupations for social status, including an assessment of the differences between male and female occupational awareness.

How careers are perceived in terms of social status by individuals employed in the occupations has been a topic of occupational research for over forty years. Anderson (1927, 1928) obtained conflicting results when he tried to determine if people employed in an occupation rate the career higher in status than people not vocationally associated with the occupation. Hartmann (1934) found little evidence that people give a higher prestige rating to their own career, in what has since come to be called "occupational ego-centrism" (Garbin, 1967). Byers (1946) and Welch (1949) upheld the lack of evidence. Other researchers, however, including Coutu (1936), Form (1946), Hatt (1950), Granger (1959), and Dolliver (1967) have found evidence supporting occupational ego-centrism. In the present study, the applicability of occupational ego-centrism to students preparing to work in specific occupations was assessed.

Vocational Counseling Implications of Occupational Social Status

Many factors influence the career development of a person including the satisfaction of vocational needs, interests, and values. Individuals vary in the importance of the consideration that they give to such differential factors. A person is attracted to occupations that offer the most appealing qualities or the least unappealing traits. As stated by Tyler (1969): "Prestige, glamor, financial security, clean hands--- all these considerations and many others help to determine which occupations are acceptable and which unacceptable" (1969, p. 146).

People also vary in the understanding that they have of the various factors that influence their career development. Some individuals need assistance in achieving a satisfactory vocational adjustment and career counseling may be helpful. The vocational counselor is in a position to assist individuals in facilitating their career development, if the counselor is aware of the factors that enter into the career decision-making process of his client.

Among the many factors that should be attended to in a vocational counseling situation is the social status of occupations. Personal needs and interests contribute significantly to achieving a satisfying level of career development for a person, but values, including the work value of prestige, are also imperative. The values of a person signify what is most important to him in his life. Work values signify what is most important to a person in his career.

In vocational counseling, if occupational prestige is to be considered, it is necessary to understand how others perceive the social status of careers. With the occupational information of the social status of careers, a person is in a more favorable position to assess the significance of the work value of prestige in his career development. If prestige is an important work value, then it may be appropriate to consider careers that will provide a reasonably high level of social status. If low status careers are given consideration as career choices, and the individual places a high value on prestige, then he should be aware of this. It may be possible to compromise the work value of prestige for other values, interests or needs.

Thomas (1956) wrote about the importance of giving consideration to social influences in vocational counseling:

. . . many teachers and counselors are inclined to consider the attractiveness of occupations as almost entirely an

individual or personal matter. To some extent it undoubtedly is, but there are just as certainly social influences in our culture which profoundly condition so-called personal preferences. In regard to vocational aspirations, these influences are among the major determinants of relative occupational attractiveness. (1956, p. 166)

Hakel, Hollmann, and Ohnesorge (1971) suggested that: "One major factor influencing occupational choices and perceptions is the prestige or social status accorded to persons in the various occupations" (1971, p. 69). Yet, the degree of the importance that occupational social approval has upon a career choice is likely to vary among individuals. Hershenson (1965) concluded that students who are "emergent" or "other-directed" are influenced more by the social status of an occupation than those people that are "traditional" or "inner-directed." People who look to others for direction may be more likely to place a high value on the social status of occupations. The influence of occupational prestige may best be viewed in vocational counseling as an individual concern; for some people the importance may be slight and for others it may be highly significant.

A situation that the counselor should be alert for in vocational counseling is when status anxiety overwhelms the career decision-making process. Levin (1949) wrote about such a case:

. . . when the major determiner of occupational choice is status anxiety, as well it may be in the case of many people, other sources of conflict can be conceived. Occupational goals may be selected which are uncongenial to basic interests, fundamental aptitudes, and even the essential personality structure. (1949, p. 33)

In career guidance the influence of occupational social status becomes particularly important when it distorts the ability of a person to assess the merits of an occupation on the basis of other factors. An individual may pursue an occupation largely due to its prestige rating and not

fully evaluate other considerations such as abilities and interests. If a client in a vocational counseling situation places an exaggerated value on status, this may indicate an area of limited personal adjustment that must be resolved before positive career development is possible. For an individual to value prestige is normal; it becomes abnormal, and a source of possible difficulties, only when the work value discourages consideration of other vocational factors. Hoppock cautioned further about such a situation:

The desire for wealth, status, glamor or anything else may lead a person to choose an occupation that he thinks will bring him these things. If he shows no interest in considering the demand for workers and his own qualifications for the work, he may reasonably be suspected of fantasy at any age. (1967, p. 103)

Some people may over-emphasize the importance of occupational social status and a more realistic appraisal of the factor is necessary in vocational counseling. For most individuals, however, the work value of prestige is not exaggerated and it is simply one of the many factors that should be given an assessment in the course of the counseling experience. Assessing values in counseling assists a person in determining what is important to him in his work and in his life. Herr (1970) stated that: "Values ascribed to some kinds of work either attract or repel specific individuals" (1970, p. 44).

In a study that investigated life goals and vocational choices of college students, Astin and Nichols (1964) found prestige to be a life goal. They defined prestige as a: ". . . striving for social recognition and, among men for social power (i.e., having 'influence' and 'being a leader')" (1964, p. 53). Rosenberg (1957) in a comprehensive study, that reached a book length, surveyed over 4,500 college students, in various colleges across the country, about their work values. Status

and prestige was one of the five work values that was rated "highly important" by the students. The other work values were; "to earn a good deal of money; to work with people; to be helpful to others; and to be creative and original" (1957, p. 50).

Super and Bohn (1970) found that students who valued the chance to earn a great deal of money and have status and prestige tended to be in the commercially oriented programs. It may be that some students seek out programs that will allow them to satisfy their work values. Program selection then may be affected by occupational prestige. This raises implications for vocational counseling in that educational planning relates directly to career development.

The prestige factor has also been investigated in relation to college majors. Zytowski (1966) found that college students were able to rate thirty major subject areas on a five category scale that he later fashioned into a rank order. The majors ranged from physics, architecture, and chemistry at the top and elementary education, drama, and physical education at the bottom of the scale. In addition, it was noted that freshmen rated their major subjects much higher in status than the sophomores, juniors, and seniors.

Within a college major a hierarchy of occupations that related to the major subject was established. Kondrasuk (1971) had graduate students rank twenty occupations in psychology for prestige. He found that a rank order of psychological occupations resulted with the professor of psychology at a large university and clinical psychologists heading the list. High school counselor, psychometrist, and employment interviewer were rated lowest by the psychology students.

The establishment of a rank order of major subjects and a ranking of occupations related to a major subject suggests evidence that a prestige dimension exists between and within major subject areas. A student who is deciding upon his major subject selection should recognize that educational planning may be influenced by social status. The vocational counselor is in a position to assist the student in recognizing and assessing the importance of social status.

The work value of prestige is not simple to measure and evaluate in a counseling situation. The factor, unlike interests or needs, is not clearly manifested in behavior. Like other values it is more abstract and subtle. In an effort to measure work values, Super (1970) devised an instrument, the Work Values Inventory (WVI), that considers fifteen work values, including prestige, of the person completing the inventory.

In an attempt to directly measure the occupational aspiration goals of high school students Haller and Miller (1971) developed the Occupational Aspiration Scale (OAS). It is an instrument that considers the realistic and idealistic aspiration level of the student, in his short and long range planning. The alternatives for each item are drawn from the occupations ranked in the National Opinion Research Center study (North and Hatt, 1949). Used in conjunction with vocational counseling, both the WVI and the OAS may contribute to counseling effectiveness in dealing with the work value of prestige.

Recognition and disposition of the work value of prestige in counseling should assist in making the occupational aspirations of clients more realistic. The professions and other high status occupations are often over-selected as career possibilities. If a person is successful

in completing the preparation required for an occupation a position may be difficult to obtain due to the over-supply of people already in the field. Other careers require advanced training in the form of graduate or professional school; often beyond the capabilities of some students. Taylor (1968) compared occupational expectations of students with the census distribution of the labor force and he found that many occupational aspirations, particularly for the professions, not congruent with actual employment possibilities. Stephenson (1952) considered the supply and demand situation that exists regarding occupational prestige:

The problem arises from the fact that there are always fewer positions of prestige than there are individuals who potentially are qualified to fill them. Prestige by its very nature, is enhanced by scarcity and super-subordinate relationships assume a pyramidal hierarchy, while individual abilities apparently are distributed in a form approximating the bell-shaped normal probability curve. (1952, p. 75).

In a state-wide survey of Washington high school juniors and seniors, Slocum and Bowles (1968) reported that when students were asked what occupation they would choose if any type of work was possible, 62.8 percent of the students named professional occupations. When the students were asked what career they actually expected to pursue, only 43.1 percent named a professional occupation.

In a related study, Clack (1968) compared fantasy and reality occupational choices of high school students and he correlated both with occupational prestige ratings. The students were given a list of twenty-eight occupations from the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) (North and Hatt, 1949) study and were instructed to rank order the occupations in terms of desirability without considering personal limitations. They were then given the same list of occupations and were asked to rank order the occupations that they would likely find employment in,

considering their personal strengths and limitations. The results indicated a high correlation between occupations ranked high in prestige in the NORC study and in the fantasy choices of the students. A low correlation was reported between the reality choices of the students and the high prestige occupations.

A part of the synthesis of realistic and fantasy occupational selection is the sorting out process of individuals that reduces the number of people who seek high status occupations. Educational and training requirements of some types of work are beyond the capabilities or interest of many. Spaeth (1970) found that the grades that a person received in college influenced his occupational prestige expectations. Students receiving "good" grades began to consider careers higher in social status and students with "low" grades reduced their interest in higher status occupations. The present research considered the relationship of rating careers for social status by college students with high and low grade point averages.

An individual should not be discouraged from seeking high status occupations, but he should be aware of the keen competition that exists for occupations that are high in prestige. The decision to choose any career should ultimately be the choice of the person who expects to work in the occupation. However, a person will be in a better position to make a sound career choice if he has access to pertinent career information. A significant part of the present study was to contribute to the occupational information available on the social status of careers for college graduates, so that more satisfactory career decisions are possible.

The studies that were reviewed in this chapter related to the problem under consideration in this study. The studies also assisted in defining areas in need of further research in the area of occupational social status. Most of the investigations had a limited number of people evaluate a small number of varied types of occupations. The present study had a comparatively high number of undergraduate students evaluate ninety-four careers for college graduates. The large number of careers assessed related directly to the occupational possibilities of the students. In most of the studies reviewed, the characteristics of the people that responded to the occupational social status surveys were not analyzed in depth. In the present study, the student respondents were divided by college, class, grade point average, and sex and their responses were analyzed.

Previous research evaluated in this chapter considered the presence of occupational ego-centrism among people employed in specific occupations. None of the studies reviewed assessed the applicability of occupational ego-centrism to people who are training for employment in an occupation. The present study considered the applicability of occupational ego-centrism to college students who are preparing for specific careers. Finally, the literature reviewed in this chapter cited the lack of realism of the occupational information of many students. The present study evaluated the knowledge that students have of careers for college graduates.

Summary

The first section of this chapter considered the nature of occupational social status. People in general seem to be able to assess the

prestige level of various occupations when they are asked to rank order or rate a small number of careers. The dimension of the social status of occupations appears to exist as a concept that may be defined and measured in terms of inventoried responses. Factors that contribute to the substance of occupational prestige were presented and evaluated in this section. Income, authority, responsibility, and education were recognized as being the most significant contributors to the content or substance of the social status of occupations.

An extensive review of the empirical studies of the social status of occupations was taken up next. The conclusion of the reviewer is in agreement with Roe (1956) after she completed a similar analysis: "Occupations in our culture have a fairly definite and constant hierarchy of prestige" (1956, p 301). It was further substantiated that divergent groups of people have measurable perceptions of occupations and that they are able to give occupations a relative rating in regard to prestige. Other comprehensive reviews may be found in work completed by Stubbins (1950) and Davies (1952). A brief, but useful and more current review, is in an article by Dolliver (1967).

The final section of this chapter dealt with the vocational counseling implications of social status. An assessment of what occupational prestige means to the counselor and to his client was made. The significance of the work value of prestige was found to vary between individuals. For some people the value is of slight importance but for others it is highly significant; including those people who attend too much to occupational prestige at the expense of other vocational factors. Status and prestige was found to be one of the goals of college students in their work. The possibility that social status may influence

the selection of an educational program and have a subsequent effect on career development was discussed. Finally, the relationship of occupational prestige to the supply and demand of occupations was considered.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe how the present study was planned and conducted. The first section of the chapter presents the procedure, including the selection of the sample. The procedure offers an over-view of the study and the sample selection reports how the subjects were chosen and the respondent data assembled. The next section discusses the construction and the content of the survey used in the research. The description of the survey includes an explanation of the scoring system employed to analyze the collected data. The final section deals with the statistical treatment of the data.

Procedure and Sample Selection

During the spring semester of 1974, a sample of undergraduate students at the Oklahoma State University were mailed a survey sheet on the "Social Status of Careers for College Graduates." The survey was developed by the researcher for the purpose of conducting the present study. It included a list of ninety-four careers that were to be rated on a five-category scale from low to high on the dimension of social status (See Appendix A). An enclosed cover letter (See Appendix B) requested that the student complete the survey and return it to the researcher in the self-addressed stamped envelope that was provided.

The selection of subjects was accomplished using a stratified random sampling procedure. The process is discussed in Guilford (1965): "Each subgroup is a sample representing a stratum within which there has been random sampling" (Guilford, 1965, pp. 164-165). A total of 504 undergraduate students at the Oklahoma State University were contacted to participate in the survey research. Seventy-two students were mailed a survey sheet from each of the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, and Home Economics. In addition, seventy-two students were sent surveys from the School of Technology. An equal number of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and senior students were included in the sample.

The total undergraduate population on the main campus of the Oklahoma State University, not including the College of Veterinary Medicine, for the spring semester of 1974 was 14,039. Veterinary students were not included in the sample because students are not accepted into the college before their junior year. The university also has a technical institute, not on the main campus, that offers two-year programs leading to the associate degree.

It was the decision of the researcher to limit the present study to the social status of careers for college graduates and to survey only students in four-year programs. If careers for graduates of two-year programs were combined with those considered in the present inquiry, the results of this study may possibly have been confounded. A separate assessment of the social status of careers for graduates of educational levels below the baccalaureate level would provide career information distinct from the present research.

College, including the school of technology, and class level were variables that were identified in the sample selection. The sex of the respondents served as the third variable in the research. Of the total of 504 students that were mailed survey sheets, 310 were men and 194 were women. After the survey sheets were returned to the researcher, the respondents were divided by grade point average (hereafter referred to as GPA) within each of the classes. A section on the survey sheet requested the respondents to indicate their GPA for all of their college courses. Each GPA was placed in a rank order from high to low for each class. Within the rank order, the top and bottom third of the scores served as the dividing point for the respondents to be classified into high and low groups. Surveys with a GPA in the middle third of the range of scores were not analyzed, in this part of the study, because the grades were not considered discriminating enough to be placed into either a high or a low group. Thus, GPA served as the fourth student variable along with college, class, and sex.

A follow-up procedure was utilized with students who did not return the survey sheet to the researcher within two weeks. The non-respondents were telephoned and asked to return the survey. Another survey sheet was mailed to the students who indicated a need for one. If the students did not return the survey upon this action, no further follow-up was made.

The Survey

The survey, "The Social Status of Careers for College Graduates," provided data that was utilized in the present study. The researcher designed the survey to measure for social status the careers that appear

in the Occupational Outlook for College Graduates (1972-1973) which is published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The handbook presents information on 106 occupations in the United States (See Appendix C) and it:

. . . is a guide for employment opportunities in a broad range of professional and related occupations for which a college education is required, is becoming increasingly necessary, or is the usual educational background for employment. (1972-1973, p. iii)

Information in the Occupational Outlook for College Graduates is reprinted from the Occupational Outlook Handbook, another Bureau of Labor Statistics publication that is printed every other year. Information is provided on occupations that includes: outlook for employment; nature of the work; places of employment; education and training requirements; working conditions; and earnings.

The Occupational Outlook for College Graduates was developed to assist student personnel workers and students. As described in the handbook:

General information on over-all patterns of change can give placement officers, counselors, and students a background to understand the outlook, the education and training requirements, and the nature of particular occupations. (1972-1973, p. 1)

Although the Occupational Outlook for College Graduates presents information on 106 occupations, only 94 of the careers were assessed in the survey used in the study. In order to yield more valid results, some of the occupational specialities were combined into broader categories. The engineering specialities may not have been familiar to many of the respondents of the survey; thus, they were classified under the general title of "engineer." The engineering specialties are: aerospace, agriculture, biomedical, ceramic, chemical, civil, electrical, industrial, mechanical, metallurgical, and mining. The clerical specialties

may have presented a religious bias that was not controlled in the study; thus, they were classified under the general title of "clergymen." The clerical specialties are: Protestant ministers, rabbis, and Roman Catholic priests.

The ninety-four occupations were randomly placed in columns in order to be rated on the four-page survey sheet. Directions were provided that requested the respondent to: "Please choose the statement that gives your opinion of the social status of each occupation as a career for a college graduate." The directions are a broad modification of those used in the National Opinion Research Center study (North and Hatt, 1949). Unlike most studies of the social status of occupations that simply request individuals to rank order occupations, the NORC survey had people rate occupations in one of five categories. Davies (1952) commented on their methodology:

It is probable that the N.O.R.C.'s use of a small number of rough categories ('excellent,' 'good,' 'average,' etc.) is more in line with many people's customary private methods of classification, than the highly discriminatory step-by-step procedure required in simple ranking studies. (1952, p. 144)

The occupations that were rated in the present study were scored on the basis of zero to one hundred. Those occupations rated "Low" were given a score of zero; those rated "Below Average" earned a twenty-five; "Average" occupational ratings were given a fifty; "Above Average" earned a seventy-five; and occupations rated "High" were given a one hundred. Theoretically, the lowest possible score that an occupation could receive was a cumulative zero, if all respondents rated the occupation "Low." The highest possible score that an occupation could receive was a cumulative one hundred, if the occupation was rated "High" by all of the respondents.

The mean scores for each occupation were computed within each of the student variables considered in this study: college, class, grade point average, and sex. From the mean scores, a rank order of occupations was constructed for each of the variables. As an example, within each of the colleges, students rated the occupations and a mean score for each occupation was derived from these ratings. The mean scores were then placed in a rank order for each college.

The present study first had the ninety-four occupations rated by students for social status and then the researcher placed them in a rank order. Hicks (1971) completed an investigation that compared differences between rating and ranking an occupation for prestige. Secondary students in Zambia rated thirty-two occupations on a five-category scale from "very low" to "very high" in prestige and the categories had associated numerical ratings from one to five. The median numerical ratings were calculated and a rank order occupational prestige hierarchy was constructed. The following day some of the students placed the same occupations in a rank order by prestige. The correlation coefficient between the two hierarchies was 0.98. Hicks concluded that on the basis of his research: ". . . the final result to the two methods of obtaining a hierarchy are substantially the same. For practical purposes, it is immaterial which of the two methods is used" (1971, p. 146).

Based on the research completed by Hicks (1971) and the precedent established in the National Opinion Research Center (North and Hatt, 1949) study, the researcher employed the methodology of first having occupations rated for social status and then transforming the ratings into quantitative scores. The scores formed the basis for establishing a rank order of the occupations and subsequent correlations.

Several advantages were noted by Hicks (1971) in utilizing a rating system rather than rankings: Ratings are easier to understand by the person completing the survey; they are easier to administer; less time is needed to complete a survey; and marking or assessing the results is less complex. In addition, far more items may be rated than ranked. It is very difficult for an individual to rank order more than twenty-five or thirty items in a manageable fashion.

The survey used in this research, "The Social Status of Careers for College Graduates," requires about ten minutes for a person to complete. The directions for the survey are simple and only six responses are possible. Ninety-four careers are rated for social status far more than the number that could be reliably ranked.

The occupation that the student planned to enter upon completion of his or her education and the grade point average for all college courses was requested in the "Personal Data" section of the survey. The future career of the student served as the basis for assessing the presence of occupational ego-centrism in the occupational choice of the individual. The grade point average was used in analyzing the relationship between the occupational social status ratings of students with high and low grade point averages in each class. A further discussion of both topics is presented under the "Statistical Treatment" in the next section.

Statistical Treatment

When a student completed the survey sheet used in the research, he or she had rated ninety-four careers on a five category scale on the dimension of social status. The scale ranges from low to high and a number (which the student did not see) was associated with each category.

The categories and associated numbers were as follows: Low, zero; Below Average, 25; Average, 50; Above Average, 75; and High, 100. The survey sheet of the student was returned in the mail to the researcher and the survey was classified by the four student variables considered in this research: college, class, grade point average, and sex. For the variable of grade point average, only student averages in the upper and lower third of their class were analyzed in the results of the study. When the student survey sheets were separated by these variables, a mean rating for each occupation was derived. The mean rating, once converted to its associated numerical designation, was placed in a rank order of occupations within each of the student variables.

Hypotheses Testing

When the rank order of occupations was established for all of the student variables it was then possible to correlate the results to answer the questions that were raised in the hypotheses in Chapter I of this study.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated among the following:

(1) The rank order of the occupations by college: Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Home Economics, and the School of Technology.

(2) The rank order of the occupations by class: freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior.

(3) The rank order of the occupations by high and low grade point average in each class: freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior.

(4) The rank order of the occupations by male and female students.

The coefficient of correlation used in this study was the Pearson product-moment correlation. A single number, the Pearson r , resulted when each of the student variables was correlated. Correlation indicates the degree of relationship between two variables; it does not show causation. Anastasi commented:

The question usually asked about correlation . . . is simply whether the correlation is significantly greater than zero. In other words, if the correlation in the population is zero, could a correlation as high as that obtained in our sample have resulted from sampling error alone? (1969, p. 76)

When two variables are correlated a coefficient of correlation is produced. The values of the correlation coefficients vary between -1.00 , indicating a perfect negative correlation and $+1.00$, indicating a perfect positive correlation. The correlation coefficient of 0.00 indicates an absence of a relationship between the correlated variables. Guilford (1965) defined the coefficient of correlation as: ". . . a single number that tells us to what extent two things are related, to what extent variations in the one go with variations in the other" (1965, p. 91).

Each of the correlations tested in this research was made at the .01 level. This means that for the correlation findings, the chances are no greater than one out of one-hundred that the population correlation is zero. The data was analyzed to answer specifically the questions that were raised in the hypotheses.

Questions

Three questions were raised in addition to the hypotheses in Chapter I of this study. The first question stated: Do individuals give a higher social status rating, on the average, to occupations that they

are preparing to work in? This question was concerned about the applicability of occupational ego-centrism to people who are preparing to work in specific occupations. Occupations that were designated as career choices by five or more students, and that appeared on the list of careers evaluated in the survey, were assessed for occupational ego-centrism. The mean ranking of a career by students preparing to work in an occupation was compared with the mean ranking of the occupation by all of the students.

The second question stated: Do individuals give a higher social status rating, on the average, to occupations that are related to the occupation that they are preparing to work in? This question was concerned about the applicability of occupational ego-centrism to people who are preparing to work in related fields. All occupations evaluated in the survey that were identified as being clearly associated with one of the colleges or the school of technology were investigated. The mean ranking of an occupation evaluated by students from the college or school of technology associated with the occupation was compared with the mean ranking of the occupation by all of the students.

The following occupations were evaluated in the survey used in this study and were identified as being clearly associated with a college or the school of technology:

The College of Agriculture

- Cooperative extension service workers
- Food scientists
- Foresters
- Landscape architects
- Soil conservationists
- Range managers

The College of Business Administration

- Accountants
- Advertising workers

Bank officers
 Hotel managers and assistants
 Industrial traffic managers
 Marketing research workers
 Personnel workers
 Public relations workers
 Purchasing agents

The College of Education
 College and university teachers
 Kindergarten and elementary school teachers
 School counselors
 Secondary school teachers

The College of Engineering
 Engineers

The College of Home Economics
 Cooperative extension service workers
 Dietitians
 Home economists
 Interior designers and decorators

The School of Technology
 Draftsmen
 Engineering and science technicians
 Industrial designers
 Technical writers

Cooperative extension service workers were evaluated in both the College of Agriculture and the College of Home Economics because an extension worker may be educated in either college depending upon the training emphasis of farm or home problems. The College of Arts and Sciences was not represented in the occupations that were clearly associated with a college. The wide-range of occupational plans of students in the College of Arts and Sciences does not allow for occupations to be grouped together as readily as agricultural, business, educational, engineering, home economics, and technical specialties.

The third question stated: What is the level of awareness of college students of the social status of careers for college graduates? An analysis of the occupations rated "not familiar" by the students who responded to the survey was completed. The directions to the students

stated that: ". . . the category of "Not Familiar" may be used for occupations that you do not have enough familiarity with to make an evaluation." Each occupation that was rated "not familiar" by more than five percent of the students sampled was reported. Finally, occupations that had a broad range of ratings and occupations that had a limited range of ratings were discussed and possible reasons for the rating differences were suggested.

Summary

Chapter III discussed the procedure and the sample selection, including a complete description of the survey, "The Social Status of Careers for College Graduates," that was utilized in this study. The process that was employed to analyze the resultant data from the survey was reported. The student variables of college, class, grade point average, and sex were recognized in regard to analyzing the data. Occupational ego-centrism was examined and a means for assessing the concept in the survey results was described. Finally, a method for reporting the occupations that were considered to be low in student awareness was provided.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was: (1) to determine how students evaluate careers for college graduates in regard to social status; (2) to assess the applicability of occupational ego-centrism to students preparing to work in occupations; and (3) to report the occupational awareness of college students.

A survey was developed by the researcher that included ninety-four occupations that appear in the Occupational Outlook for College Graduates (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1972-1973). Six possible response categories were provided on the survey sheet in order for the occupations to be evaluated for social status. The survey also requested the students to state their grade point average for all college courses and the occupation that they expected to enter upon completion of their education. The survey was completed by college students who were classified by the variables of: college, class, grade point average, and sex. The results of this study were analyzed utilizing the procedures that were outlined in Chapter III.

This chapter will present the results of this investigation, including tables and other compiled information, that will specifically relate to the hypotheses and the other aspects of the purpose of the

study. A summary of the data will be provided at the conclusion of the chapter.

The Response to the Survey

Of the 504 surveys that were mailed to the undergraduate students as a part of this study, 318 were returned to the researcher. This is a reply percentage of 63.1. Seventy-two surveys were sent to students chosen randomly from each of the six undergraduate colleges and the School of Technology at the Oklahoma State University. The following number of survey sheets were returned by students from each college: Agriculture, 36; Arts and Sciences, 51; Business Administration, 47; Education, 50; Engineering, 43; Home Economics, 51; and the School of Technology, 40. One hundred and eighty-five males and 133 females returned the survey sheets to the researcher.

Table I presents the total ranking of the occupations evaluated in the survey. The table reports the rank order, mean rating, and the standard deviation of the rating of each occupation. The occupations ranged from physicians, lawyers, and dentists at the top of the rank order to librarians, dancers, and sanitarians at the bottom. The mean score for the ratings was 55.4 and the range of the ratings was from 89.5 to 27.1. The average standard deviation for all of the occupations was 21.29. Personnel workers had the smallest standard deviation of the rankings with a score of 16.52 and actors and actresses had the largest standard deviation of the rankings with a score of 30.21.

Several general observations may be noted in the ranking of the occupations. Scientific, including health service, careers received rank order placements that were towards the top of the listing. Business

TABLE I
TOTAL RANKING OF OCCUPATIONS

Occupation	Rank	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Physicians	1	89.5	19.23
Lawyers	2	86.4	22.09
Dentists	3	83.5	19.95
Veterinarians	4	80.2	21.50
Biochemists	5	79.3	23.10
Engineers	6	77.8	19.98
Chemists	7	77.2	22.15
Optometrists	8	76.4	22.55
Physicists	9	76.1	21.79
Engineering and science technicians	10	74.4	20.50
Architects	11	73.7	20.98
Osteopathic physicians	12	73.5	25.22
Geophysicists	13	70.4	21.85
Pharmacists	14	67.9	20.50
Psychologists	15	67.3	25.61
College and university teachers . .	16	67.0	19.95
Systems analysts	17	65.3	19.75
Flight engineers	18	65.2	21.74
Pilots and copilots	19	64.9	21.80
Accountants	20	64.8	22.04
Life scientists	21	64.4	22.70
Oceanographers	22	64.2	22.06
Podiatrists	23	62.8	25.00
Physical therapists	24	62.8	20.79
Registered nurses	25	62.5	22.39
FBI special agents	26	62.1	24.45
Mathematicians	27	61.6	21.00
Geologists	28	61.4	21.30
Landscape architects	29	60.2	21.38
Statisticians	30	60.2	22.06
Industrial designers	31	60.1	19.24
Hospital administrators	32	59.5	19.97
Food scientists	33	59.5	22.19
Meteorologists	34	59.3	20.61
Speech pathologists and audiologists	35	59.1	21.46
Bank officers	36	58.7	21.71
Anthropologists	37	58.4	23.53
Clergymen	38	57.3	24.84
Dental hygienists	39	57.2	20.71
Astronomers	40	56.9	24.58
Economists	41	55.8	20.34
Actors and actresses	42	55.5	30.21
City managers	43	55.3	22.91
Medical laboratory workers	44	54.8	19.72
Occupational therapists	45	54.4	17.87

TABLE I (Continued)

Occupation	Rank	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Chiropractors	46	54.4	28.19
Soil conservationists	47	54.3	19.70
Draftsmen	48	53.9	19.47
Marketing research workers	49	53.9	18.40
Soil scientists	50	53.2	19.98
Interior designers and decorators	51	53.1	22.06
Urban planners	52	52.8	21.10
Political scientists	53	52.7	24.30
Programmers	54	52.4	19.35
Technical writers	55	51.1	18.84
Dietitians	56	50.9	21.14
Sociologists	57	50.6	22.97
Commercial artists	58	50.4	22.24
Rehabilitation counselors	59	50.3	21.29
Secondary school teachers	60	50.0	19.45
Foresters	61	49.7	19.49
Musicians and music teachers	62	49.4	22.07
Geographers	63	49.3	20.36
Public relations workers	64	49.0	20.03
Historians	65	48.4	21.73
School counselors	66	48.0	19.91
Advertising workers	67	47.8	17.71
Career planning and placement counselors	68	47.6	22.01
Kindergarten and elementary teachers	69	46.9	22.24
Airline dispatchers	70	46.7	22.01
Actuaries	71	45.4	25.00
Social workers	72	44.9	21.39
Home economists	73	44.3	20.47
Cooperative extension service workers	74	44.3	19.84
Singers and singing teachers	75	43.5	22.51
Range managers	76	43.5	20.21
Insurance agents and brokers	77	43.5	21.25
Employment counselors	78	43.2	18.05
Personnel workers	79	43.2	16.52
Industrial traffic managers	80	42.7	19.70
Purchasing agents	81	42.6	19.62
Medical record librarians	82	42.5	19.43
Hotel managers and assistants	83	42.5	20.62
Newspaper reporters	84	42.3	20.62
Licensed merchant marine officers	85	42.2	21.40
Insurance underwriters	86	42.0	19.91
Securities salesmen	87	40.2	17.20
Recreation workers	88	39.7	19.31
Insurance claim examiners	89	39.1	20.06
Manufacturers' salesmen	90	38.2	20.10

TABLE I (Continued)

Occupation	Rank	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Insurance claim adjusters	91	37.5	19.82
Librarians	92	33.9	21.03
Dancers	93	31.3	24.51
Sanitarians	94	27.1	24.00

administration positions received scattered rankings. As an example, accountants placed twentieth on the list and purchasing agents had a ranking of eighty-one. Of the social science occupations, that include anthropologists, economists, geographers, historians, political scientists, and sociologists, only anthropologists received a ranking in the top one-half. Teaching careers, other than college and university teachers, were ranked in the bottom one-half. Counseling occupations, excluding psychologists, also had rankings that were below the mid-point of the ranks. Finally, insurance occupations received ranks that placed them towards the bottom of the ranks.

Although occupational ranks are provided in the results of this study, the occupations were not actually ranked by the respondents to the survey. The students evaluated ninety-four occupations by responding to five evaluation categories that were converted by the researcher into ranks. A sixth category allowed for the rating of "not familiar." This response was not utilized in the construction of the ranks of the occupations. A complete description of the data analysis procedure is provided in Chapter III of this study.

Table II identifies the percentages of responses within each of the categories for each of the occupations assessed in the survey. As an example, physicians received the following percentages of responses: High, 70 percent; Above Average, 23 percent; Average, 5 percent; Below Average, 1 percent; and Low, 2 percent. In addition, 2 percent of the respondents placed the occupation of physician in the "Not Familiar" category. The mean rating of each occupation is again presented.

Averages for the responses to each category are divided among the categories. The students who responded to the survey gave "High" ratings to the careers 10.4 percent of the time. Other categories and their respective percentages are: Above Average, 26.7 percent; Average, 43.8 percent; Below Average, 13.7 percent; and Low, 5.5 percent. The mean rating of the "not familiar" responses was 8 percent. The mean rating is misleading, however, due to several exceptionally high scores. As an example, actuaries were rated "not familiar" by 81 percent of the students and podiatrists received a "not familiar" rating by almost one-half of the student respondents. The median score of 4 percent provides a more accurate figure for the number of "not familiar" responses. It should be noted that the percentages of the "not familiar" responses were calculated separately from the five evaluation categories.

This section of the chapter reported responses to the survey in general terms. The next section will relate the student variables to the evaluation of the social status of careers for college graduates.

Occupational Social Status and Student Variables

Student responses to the survey used in this investigation were separated by the variables of college, class, grade point average, and sex. The responses were categorized to answer the questions raised in

TABLE II
TOTALS OF OCCUPATION RATINGS

Occupation	High	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Low	Not Familiar	Mean Rating
Physicians	70%	23%	5%	1%	2%	2%	89.5
Lawyers	63	26	6	2	2	2	86.4
Dentists	51	36	12	1	1	2	83.5
Veterinarians	44	36	16	2	1	1	80.2
Biochemists	44	37	15	2	2	2	79.3
Engineers	34	46	18	1	1	1	77.8
Chemists	37	42	18	3	2	3	77.2
Optometrists	35	43	18	3	2	5	76.4
Physicists	34	42	21	2	2	3	76.1
Engineering and science technicians	27	50	21	2	1	2	74.4
Architects	25	51	20	2	2	1	73.7
Osteopathic physicians	34	38	21	5	3	12	73.5
Geophysicists	21	49	22	7	1	19	70.4
Pharmacists	15	49	31	5	1	2	67.9
Psychologists	21	44	24	7	5	3	67.3
College and university teachers	13	49	33	4	2	1	67.0
Systems analysts	11	45	37	5	1	31	65.3
Flight engineers	15	40	39	4	2	8	65.2
Pilots and copilots	12	47	32	7	2	2	64.9
Accountants	15	40	38	5	2	1	64.8
Life scientists	16	40	39	7	2	15	64.4
Oceanographers	11	47	32	7	3	6	64.2
Podiatrists	13	44	30	7	6	46	62.8
Physical therapists	10	41	39	8	1	4	62.8
Registered nurses	14	32	45	6	2	2	62.5
FBI special agents	13	41	35	7	5	4	62.1
Mathematicians	9	39	42	8	2	3	61.6
Geologists	9	40	41	8	2	3	61.4
Landscape architects	6	44	38	9	3	3	60.2
Statisticians	9	37	42	9	3	8	60.2
Industrial designers	6	37	49	5	2	8	60.1
Hospital administrators	5	41	44	7	3	3	59.5
Food scientists	10	32	46	10	3	12	59.5
Meteorologists	7	34	49	7	3	7	59.3
Speech pathologists and audiologists	6	39	44	7	4	6	59.1
Bank officers	7	38	43	9	4	3	58.7
Anthropologists	7	42	35	12	5	15	58.4
Clergymen	11	27	47	8	7	4	57.3
Dental hygienists	7	30	52	9	3	3	57.2
Astronomers	9	33	41	11	6	7	56.9

TABLE II (Continued)

Occupation	High	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Low	Not Familiar	Mean Rating
Economists	4%	32%	51%	9%	4%	3%	55.8
Actors and actresses . . .	16	29	27	19	10	7	55.5
City managers	5	35	43	11	6	4	55.3
Medical laboratory workers	4	28	55	11	3	3	54.8
Occupational therapists	4	23	61	11	1	12	54.4
Chiropractors	10	33	34	13	11	6	54.4
Soil conservationists	5	23	58	11	3	6	54.3
Draftsmen	4	26	57	11	3	4	53.9
Marketing research workers	2	28	57	10	3	9	53.9
Soil scientists	3	26	54	14	3	8	53.2
Interior designers and decorators	3	30	48	13	6	2	53.1
Urban planners	6	12	49	31	2	8	52.8
Political scientists	8	13	44	29	5	4	52.7
Programmers	4	11	59	23	3	10	52.4
Technical writers	4	12	62	19	2	21	51.1
Dietitians	5	16	54	21	4	4	50.9
Sociologists	3	25	51	13	8	3	50.6
Commerical artists	3	25	50	15	7	4	50.4
Rehabilitation counselors	4	21	53	19	4	4	50.3
Secondary school teachers	4	14	64	15	4	1	50.0
Foresters	3	18	58	18	4	3	49.7
Musicians and music teachers	4	21	52	17	7	3	49.4
Geographers	3	17	58	17	5	10	49.3
Public relations workers	3	15	61	15	5	2	49.0
Historians	3	20	49	22	5	6	48.4
School counselors	1	20	55	19	5	3	48.0
Advertising workers	*	15	64	16	4	4	47.8
Career planning and placement counselors	3	12	65	15	6	4	47.6
Kindergarten and elementary school teachers	5	11	57	19	7	2	46.9
Airline dispatchers	3	17	57	19	7	10	46.7
Actuaries	3	20	43	22	12	81	45.4
Social workers	3	13	53	25	7	3	44.9
Home economists	2	10	60	20	9	5	44.3
Cooperative extension services workers	2	9	62	19	8	34	44.3
Singers and singing teachers	3	11	54	21	11	4	43.5
Range managers	1	12	55	21	11	29	43.5

TABLE II (Continued)

Occupation	High	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Low	Not Familiar	Mean Rating
Insurance agents and brokers	2%	9%	59%	19%	10%	2%	43.5
Employment counselors . .	1	8	60	26	6	4	43.2
Personnel workers *		6	63	26	4	7	43.2
Industrial traffic managers	1	10	57	24	8	24	42.7
Purchasing agents	1	8	61	21	9	12	42.6
Medical record libra- rians	1	9	55	28	7	7	42.5
Hotel managers and assistants	1	11	54	24	9	3	42.5
Newspaper reporters . . .	1	12	53	26	9	2	42.3
Licensed merchant marine officers	*	15	49	27	10	18	42.2
Insurance underwriters *		9	59	21	10	21	42.0
Securities salemen . . . *		5	57	33	6	11	40.2
Recreation workers . . .	1	7	50	35	8	5	39.7
Insurance claim ad- justers	1	6	55	27	12	6	39.1
Manufacturers' sales- men	*	8	47	33	11	3	38.2
Insurance claim ad- justers	*	5	53	29	13	4	37.5
Librarians	1	5	40	37	17	2	33.9
Dancers	2	10	25	40	24	7	31.3
Sanitarians	2	3	30	31	33	11	27.1

*Less than 0.5%

All figures are to nearest whole percent

The highest correlation, .96 in the table, is between the Colleges of Education and Home Economics. The lowest correlation is between the Colleges of Agriculture and Business with a correlation coefficient of .83. All of the correlations are high and they indicate that students in all of the colleges have similar perceptions of the social status of careers for college graduates.

In order to assess specific differences in perceptions between the colleges it is necessary to observe the ranking of the occupations by college. Table IV presents the ranking of the occupations by the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Home Economics, and the School of Technology. In addition, the rank of the occupations by all colleges is provided.

It may be noted from the table that occupations that are possible to identify with a college are generally given a higher ranking in the associated college than in the other colleges. As an example, in the College of Engineering, engineers are given a mean ranking of two; the mean rank for engineers in all of the colleges is six. This observation will be given further consideration in the next section of the chapter under "occupational ego-centrism."

Another general trend is somewhat less apparent in the ranking of the occupations by college. Occupations that are the least related to each of the colleges often have a ranking that is lower than the average ranking for the occupation in all of the other colleges. As an example, psychologists received the lowest rank from the Colleges of Agriculture and Engineering. This observation, however, has many exceptions in the table and it is mentioned only to suggest a possible trend.

TABLE IV
RANKING OF OCCUPATIONS BY COLLEGE

Occupation	Rank by All Colleges	Agri- culture	Arts & Sciences	Busi- ness	Educa- tion	Engi- neering	Home Eco- nomics	School of Tech- nology
Physicians	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1
Lawyers	2	4	3	2	2	3	1	2
Dentists	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	5
Veterinarians	4	1	6	11	4	6	7	7
Biochemists	5	6	4	6	6	5	3	8
Engineers	6	14	9	7	5	2	10	3
Chemists	7	9	5	10	7	10	5	10
Optometrists	8	11	7	8	9	11	8	4
Physicists	9	12	8	12	10	8	6	9
Engineering and science tech- nicians	10	19	12	9	12	7	9	6
Architects	11	13	11	5	8	9	14	14
Osteopathic physicians	12	5	10	13	11	13	13	12
Geophysicists	13	17	16	14	13	14	12	15
Pharmacists	14	10	21	15	17	21	15	20
Psychologists	15	24	14	16	15	23	17	18
College and university teachers	16	16	19	18	20	12	19	19
Systems analysts	17	28	20	20	14	18	20	21
Flight engineers	18	23	24	22	27	16	21	11
Pilots and copilots	19	20	25	17	29	15	32	13
Accountants	20	43	26	4	16	25	37	26
Life scientists	21	37	15	38	19	28	11	24
Oceanographers	22	21	13	29	28	22	30	16
Podiatrists	23	30	17	21	33	20	34	42
Physical therapists	24	18	22	27	21	40	22	25
Registered nurses	25	7	18	36	26	24	40	27
FBI special agents	26	15	38	24	30	32	18	28
Mathematicians	27	33	34	31	32	19	29	17
Geologists	28	42	30	25	18	30	33	30

TABLE IV (Continued)

Occupation	Rank by All Colleges	Agri- culture	Arts & Sciences	Busi- ness	Educa- tion	Engi- neering	Home Eco- nomics	School of Tech- nology
Landscape architects	29	31	36	30	34	31	27	23
Statisticians	30	35	37	26	24	29	28	37
Industrial designers	31	58	32	33	36	17	35	22
Hospital administrators	32	51	31	28	25	37	31	39
Food scientists	33	22	44	48	22	41	16	47
Meteorologists	34	25	28	44	45	33	25	29
Speech pathologists and audiologists	35	29	33	37	23	38	36	46
Bank officers	36	39	47	19	31	35	39	38
Anthropologists	37	47	29	43	35	26	38	45
Clergymen	38	32	27	35	38	59	42	36
Dental hygienists	39	8	40	42	51	51	43	31
Astronomers	40	61	39	52	37	34	23	32
Economists	41	26	43	32	47	50	53	49
Actors and actresses	42	66	23	59	48	39	41	52
City managers	43	62	46	23	46	43	44	61
Medical laboratory workers	44	49	49	50	39	44	45	41
Occupational therapists	45	46	41	46	40	46	47	63
Chiropractors	46	36	59	34	53	47	48	54
Soil conservationists	47	27	51	47	60	48	54	34
Draftsmen	48	55	57	41	63	36	55	35
Marketing research workers	49	50	58	39	41	56	49	58
Soil scientists	50	38	48	58	58	49	52	50
Interior designers and decorators	51	49	63	57	43	55	24	56
Urban planners	52	59	50	43	56	45	51	43
Political scientists	53	74	55	40	57	53	26	75
Programmers	54	60	69	49	70	27	62	33
Technical writers	55	70	61	45	78	42	56	44
Dietitians	56	57	64	60	49	58	46	67
Sociologists	57	13	35	67	50	70	50	66

TABLE IV (Continued)

Occupation	Rank by All Colleges	Agri- culture	Arts & Sciences	Busi- ness	Educa- tion	Engi- neering	Home Eco- nomists	School of Tech- nology
Commercial artists	58	54	53	56	52	65	60	64
Rehabilitation counselors . . .	59	56	54	74	44	66	59	57
Secondary school teachers . . .	60	41	66	68	55	54	65	51
Foresters	61	40	42	82	68	64	73	48
Musicians and music teachers . .	62	44	67	72	62	57	57	62
Geographers	63	63	60	66	59	60	58	65
Public relations workers	64	53	56	55	54	78	66	69
Historians	65	77	45	43	67	69	61	73
School counselors	66	80	70	64	42	63	64	71
Advertising workers	67	72	52	54	69	76	68	72
Career planning and placement counselors	68	85	62	61	65	67	63	70
Kindergarten and elementary school teachers	69	45	72	89	66	61	80	59
Airline dispatchers	70	52	76	69	71	68	81	53
Actuaries	71	81	65	53	64	52	67	94
Social workers	72	73	68	88	61	81	76	76
Home economists	73	65	88	80	73	79	72	60
Cooperative extension service workers	74	48	79	84	82	77	79	88
Singers and singing teachers . .	75	68	81	78	77	74	69	84
Range managers	76	34	70	85	88	91	92	40
Insurance agents and brokers . .	77	87	71	70	76	84	71	74
Employment counselors	78	67	77	83	75	80	78	83
Personnel workers	79	79	75	75	81	73	84	78
Industrial traffic managers . . .	80	76	83	65	85	72	89	68
Purchasing agents	81	83	86	79	74	75	74	79
Medical record librarians . . .	82	82	74	86	72	82	86	77
Hotel managers and assistants . .	83	78	73	73	79	89	70	85
Newspaper reporters	84	89	84	77	80	71	75	80

TABLE IV (Continued)

Occupation	Rank by All Colleges	Agri- culture	Arts & Sciences	Busi- ness	Educa- tion	Engi- neering	Home Eco- nomics	School of Tech- nology
Licensed merchant marine officers	85	69	85	91	91	62	77	55
Insurance underwriters	86	84	87	63	84	83	83	82
Securities salesmen	87	86	80	71	90	88	85	81
Recreation workers	88	64	82	90	87	85	90	86
Insurance claim examiners	89	91	91	81	83	87	87	89
Manufacturers' salesmen	90	92	92	76	86	92	88	87
Insurance claim adjusters	91	93	90	87	89	86	87	90
Librarians	92	90	93	92	92	90	91	92
Dancers	93	94	89	93	93	94	93	91
Sanitarians	94	88	94	94	94	93	94	93

The second hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior students. Table V presents the correlation coefficients between occupation ranks among the classes. Again a correlation coefficient of .26 is necessary for significance at the .01 level and each of the coefficients is above that level. The second hypothesis is rejected. It may be concluded that: a significant relationship exists between the social status rankings by students from each of the classes.

TABLE V
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN OCCUPATION RANKS
AMONG CLASSES

Class	Freshmen	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
Freshmen95	.95	.96
Sophomore97	.97
Junior97
Senior

The high correlations between each of the classes indicates that the perceptions of the social status of careers for college graduates are very similar among the classes. There are, however, some clear differences in the ratings of some of the occupations. Table VI presents a ranking of the occupations by class level. As an example, from the table it can be seen that freshmen rated systems analysts and

TABLE VI
RANKING OF OCCUPATIONS BY CLASS LEVEL

Occupation	Rank by All Classes	Fresh- men	Sopho- more	Junior	Senior
Physicians	1	2	1	1	1
Lawyers	2	1	2	2	3
Dentists	3	2	3	3	2
Veterinarians	4	4	5	8	4
Biochemists	5	5	4	5	5
Engineers	6	7	8	4	6
Chemists	7	8	6	6	8
Optometrists	8	10	7	9	9
Physicists	9	9	11	7	7
Engineering and science techni- cians	10	6	12	11	11
Architects	11	13	10	10	10
Osteopathic physicians	12	12	9	12	12
Geophysicists	13	11	16	13	13
Pharmacists	14	14	18	14	15
Psychologists	15	16	17	15	16
College and university teachers	16	17	20	17	14
Systems analysts	17	39	19	16	18
Flight engineers	18	18	16	22	20
Pilots and copilots	19	21	15	18	25
Accountants	20	23	21	20	17
Life scientists	21	15	24	19	33
Oceanographers	22	28	14	26	22
Podiatrists	23	42	30	21	19
Physical therapists	24	19	29	29	21
Registered nurses	25	20	31	23	26
FBI special agents	26	27	22	32	24
Mathematicians	27	24	23	25	35
Geologists	28	25	33	28	23
Landscape architects	29	22	25	34	39
Statisticians	30	48	26	24	30
Industrial designers	31	37	28	27	36
Hospital administrators	32	30	36	31	37
Food scientists	33	33	27	35	38
Meteorologists	34	26	44	33	31
Speech pathologists and audio- logists	35	36	42	30	29
Bank officers	36	44	32	40	27
Anthropologists	37	38	41	37	28
Clergymen	38	52	34	46	32
Dental hygienists	39	35	43	44	34
Astronomers	40	31	38	39	42
Economists	41	60	35	36	43
Actors and actresses	42	34	37	60	40
City managers	43	51	39	38	45

TABLE VI (Continued)

Occupation	Rank				
	By All Classes	Fresh- men	Sopho- more	Junior	Senior
Medical laboratory workers	44	43	50	47	41
Occupational therapists	45	40	45	52	44
Chiropractors	46	29	58	41	56
Soil conservationists	47	41	51	45	50
Draftsmen	48	45	48	43	55
Marketing research workers	49	57	40	48	48
Soil scientists	50	46	46	50	54
Interior designers and decorators .	51	47	52	49	51
Urban planners	52	65	53	42	49
Political scientists	53	32	47	51	71
Programmers	54	62	49	53	46
Technical writers	55	55	61	54	52
Dietitians	56	58	66	57	47
Sociologists	57	49	54	71	58
Commercial artists	58	53	55	64	60
Rehabilitation counselors	59	64	56	59	61
Secondary school teachers	60	66	64	58	57
Foresters	61	59	59	63	62
Musicians and music teachers	62	50	67	56	70
Geographers	63	56	57	61	67
Public relations workers	64	54	71	65	59
Historians	65	76	62	55	64
School counselors	66	61	63	69	66
Advertising workers	67	75	60	66	63
Career planning and placement counselors	68	63	69	67	65
Kindergarten and elementary school teachers	69	71	75	62	69
Airline dispatchers	70	69	65	79	68
Actuaries	71	67	79	91	53
Social workers	72	72	73	75	74
Home economists	73	68	86	72	73
Cooperative extension service workers	74	73	85	70	77
Singers and singing teachers	75	70	74	84	85
Range managers	76	86	68	85	72
Insurance agents and brokers	77	74	76	73	86
Employment counselors	78	77	82	81	78
Personnel workers	79	79	84	74	75
Industrial traffic managers	80	83	70	82	84
Purchasing agents	81	85	81	77	75
Medical record librarians	82	87	77	78	80
Hotel managers and assistants	83	78	72	89	81
Newspaper reporters	84	80	78	80	82
Licensed merchant marine officers .	85	82	80	76	83
Insurance underwriters	86	88	89	68	79
Securities salesmen	87	91	83	83	87

TABLE VI (Continued)

Occupation	Rank by All Classes	Fresh- men	Sopho- more	Junior	Senior
Recreation workers	88	84	87	87	88
Insurance claim examiners	89	81	91	86	91
Manufacturers' salesmen	90	89	88	90	89
Insurance claim adjusters	91	90	90	88	92
Librarians	92	93	93	92	90
Dancers	93	92	92	94	93
Sanitarians	94	94	94	93	94

statisticians far below the evaluations made by students from the other three classes.

Other examples of prominent differences in the perceptions of specific occupations between classes are the careers of landscape architects, chiropractors, and political scientists. The social status ranking of each of these occupations goes appreciably down from the freshmen through the senior class. Possible explanations for the differences between the perceptions of specific occupations between the classes will be considered in the next chapter.

The third hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by students with high and low grade point averages in each class.

Students with a GPA in the lower third of their class were placed in a low GPA group and students with a GPA in the upper third of their class were placed in a high group. As explained in Chapter III of this study, students with grades that placed them in the middle third of their class were not assessed in this evaluation because their grades

were not considered discriminating enough by the researcher to place them into a high or a low group.

Table VII presents the correlation coefficients between occupation ranks by grade point average among the classes. A correlation coefficient of .26 is necessary for significance at the .01 level. Each of the correlations between the high and low GPA groups in each class is far above this level. The third hypothesis is rejected. It may be concluded that: a significant relationship exists between the social status rankings of students with high and low grade point averages in each class.

TABLE VII
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN OCCUPATION RANKS BY
GRADE POINT AVERAGE AMONG CLASSES

Grade Point Average	Freshmen	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
High-Low correlation coefficient	.86	.89	.94	.90

As indicated in the table, there is a slight increasing trend of the correlation coefficients from the freshmen through the junior year; for the seniors the trend is reversed somewhat. Overall, however, the uniformity of the correlations between the rankings of students with high and low grade point averages in each of the classes suggests that the perceptions of the social status of the careers evaluated by the students, regardless of their grades, is very similar.

The fourth hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by male and female students. The correlation coefficient between the male and female student rankings in this study was .96. A correlation coefficient of .26 is necessary for significance at the .01 level. The coefficient obtained in this study was far above .26; therefore, the fourth hypothesis is rejected. It may be concluded that: there is a significant relationship between the social status rankings of male and female students.

The correlation between the rankings was so high that only by observing specific occupations is it possible to assess differences between the male and female evaluations. Table VIII presents the ranking of the occupations by male and female students. The male students rated several occupations markedly higher than the female students. Pilots and copilots, oceanographers, programmers, foresters, and range managers were all given much higher rankings by the male students. It may be noted that four of the five occupations cited are conducted at least part of the time outdoors.

Women gave markedly higher rankings to the careers of podiatrists, food scientists, interior designers and decorators, political scientists, school counselors, social workers, and newspaper reporters. Generally, women gave careers in the social sciences and service occupations higher ratings than the male respondents. Women also gave higher ratings, on the average, to almost all types of careers. This observation is consistent with the findings in the National Opinion Research Center (North and Hatt, 1949) study that considered the responses of females in rating occupations by social status.

TABLE VIII
RANKING OF OCCUATIONS BY MALE AND
FEMALE STUDENTS

Occupation	All Students	Male	Female
Physicians	1	1	1
Lawyers	2	2	2
Dentists	3	3	3
Veterinarians	4	4	6
Biochemists	5	6	4
Engineers	6	5	7
Chemists	7	9	5
Optometrists	8	7	9
Physicists	9	8	8
Engineering and science technicians	10	11	10
Architects	11	10	11
Osteopathic physicians	12	12	12
Geophysicists	13	13	14
Pharmacists	14	17	13
Psychologists	15	19	15
College and university teachers	16	15	19
Systems analysts	17	20	17
Flight engineers	18	16	30
Pilots and copilots	19	14	32
Accountants	20	21	20
Life scientists	21	23	16
Oceanographers	22	18	29
Podiatrists	23	34	18
Physical therapists	24	22	22
Registered nurses	25	27	21
FBI special agents	26	24	23
Mathematicians	27	29	25
Geologists	28	26	28
Landscape architects	29	25	34
Statisticians	30	33	26
Industrial designers	31	28	33
Hospital administrators	32	37	27
Food scientists	33	40	24
Meteorologists	34	32	35
Speech pathologists and audiologists	35	38	31
Bank officers	36	30	37
Anthropologists	37	31	39
Clergymen	38	36	42
Dental hygienists	39	35	43
Astronomers	40	44	36
Economists	41	39	45
Actors and actresses	42	41	46
City managers	43	42	47
Medical laboratory workers	44	51	40

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Occupation	All Students	Male	Female
Occupational therapists	45	49	44
Chiropractors	46	49	44
Soil conservationists	47	43	53
Draftsmen	48	46	52
Marketing research workers	49	52	49
Soil scientists	50	48	54
Interior designers and decorators	51	57	41
Urban planners	52	50	56
Political scientists	53	58	38
Programmers	54	47	61
Technical writers	55	54	60
Dietitians	56	64	50
Sociologists	57	67	48
Commercial artists	58	53	67
Rehabilitation counselors	59	60	55
Secondary school teachers	60	56	65
Foresters	61	55	69
Musicians and music teachers	62	62	58
Geographers	63	59	62
Public relations workers	64	61	63
Historians	65	69	59
School counselors	66	72	57
Advertising workers	67	68	66
Career planning and placement counselors	68	71	64
Kindergarten and elementary teachers	69	66	70
Airline dispatchers	70	65	71
Actuaries	71	70	73
Social workers	72	83	68
Home economists	73	76	72
Cooperative extension service workers	74	73	79
Singers and singing teachers	75	78	76
Range managers	76	63	90
Insurance agents and brokers	77	82	74
Employment counselors	78	81	78
Personnel workers	79	77	81
Industrial traffic managers	80	74	85
Purchasing agents	81	79	82
Medical record librarians	82	85	80
Hotel managers and assistants	83	86	77
Newspaper reporters	84	88	75
Licensed merchant marine officers	85	75	86
Insurance underwriters	86	80	84
Securities salesmen	87	84	88
Recreation workers	88	87	89
Insurance claim examiners	89	90	83
Manufacturers' salesmen	90	89	91
Insurance claim adjusters	91	91	87

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Occupation	All Students	Male	Female
Librarians	92	92	93
Dancers	93	94	92
Sanitarians	94	93	94

The correlation coefficient of the occupation ranks by males and females of .96 is comparable with the other studies that have investigated the relationship of sex and occupational social status rankings. As reported by Stefflre, (1968, p. 766) correlations are generally above .90 when comparisons are made between the evaluations of the prestige of occupations by men and women.

Occupational Ego-centrism

Occupational ego-centrism may be defined as the possibility that individuals rate the occupation in which they are employed higher in status than those people that are not vocationally associated with the occupation. A review of the studies of occupational ego-centrism is provided in an article by Garbin (1967, p. 119). The present study was concerned about the possible extension of the definition of occupational ego-centrism to include people who are preparing to work in specific occupations. Do people who are training for a career rate the career higher in status than those individuals not preparing to work in the occupation?

In order to answer the question, the mean social status ratings of ten occupations evaluated by students preparing to work in specific

occupations were compared with the mean ratings of the same occupations evaluated by all of the students who completed the survey used in this study. The ten occupations were chosen because five or more students listed them as career choices and they were among the occupations evaluated in the survey.

Table IX presents the results of the comparison. Students preparing to work in specific occupations rated the occupations, on the average, 9.57 points higher than those students not vocationally associated with the occupation. The ratings for all of the occupations rated in the survey ranged from a high of 89.5 to a low of 27.1. Each of the ten careers that were assessed were given a higher status rating by students preparing to work in the occupation. As an example, it can be seen from the table that the thirteen accounting students rated their prospective career almost twenty points higher than the students in general. Support for the possibility that people rate the career that they are training for higher in status than those individuals not vocationally associated with the occupation, is presented in the table.

A related area of research in occupational ego-centrism is the possibility that people rate occupations that are associated with their occupational field higher in status than those individuals not vocationally associated with the field. In order to evaluate this question, occupations that appeared in the survey used in this study and that were identified by the researcher as being associated with a college were identified. The mean rankings for each of the occupations associated with a college were compared between students from the associated college and all of the students who completed the survey.

TABLE IX
OCCUPATIONS RATED BY STUDENTS PREPARING
TO WORK IN SPECIFIC CAREERS

Occupation	Number of Students	Rating	Rating by All Students
Accountants	13	84.6	64.8
Architects	8	78.1	73.7
Engineers	30	86.7	77.8
Engineering and science technicians	24	78.1	74.4
Foresters	5	60.0	49.7
Kindergarten and elementary teachers	28	53.8	46.9
Lawyers	6	95.8	86.4
Marketing and research workers	6	70.8	53.9
Secondary school teachers	27	58.3	50.0
Veterinarians	8	87.5	80.2

Table X presents twenty-eight occupations that were identified as being associated with a college. The rankings by all students and the rankings by students from the associated colleges are listed. Of the twenty-eight occupations, twenty-five of them were given a higher ranking by students from the college that offers a degree related to the occupation. Overall, the occupations that were identified as being associated with a college were given a ranking 10.5 places higher by students from the associated college over the average ranking by students from other colleges.

Some of the occupations were given markedly higher evaluations by students from associated colleges. As an example, students from the College of Agriculture ranked foresters twenty-one places higher and range managers forty-two places higher than students from the other colleges. It should be pointed out again that the students did not actually rank order the occupations in the survey. They responded to a

TABLE X
RANKING OF SELECTED OCCUPATIONS ASSOCIATED
WITH A COLLEGE

Occupation	College	Rank by All Students	Rank by Students from Associated College
Cooperative extension service workers	Agriculture	74	48
Food scientists	Agriculture	33	22
Foresters	Agriculture	61	40
Landscape architects	Agriculture	29	31
Soil conservationists	Agriculture	50	27
Range managers	Agriculture	76	34
Accountants	Business	20	4
Advertising workers	Business	67	54
Bank officers	Business	36	19
Hotel managers and assistants	Business	83	73
Industrial traffic managers	Business	80	65
Marketing research workers	Business	49	39
Personnel workers	Business	79	75
Public relations workers	Business	64	55
Purchasing agents	Business	81	79
College and university teachers	Education	16	20
Kindergarten and ele- mentary teachers	Education	69	66
School counselors	Education	66	42
Secondary school teachers	Education	60	55
Engineers	Engineering	6	2
Cooperative extension service workers	Home Economics	74	79
Dietitians	Home Economics	56	46
Home economists	Home Economics	73	72
Interior designers and decorators	Home Economics	51	24
Draftsmen	Sch. of Tech.	48	35
Engineering and sci- ence technicians	Sch. of Tech.	10	6
Industrial designers	Sch. of Tech.	31	22
Technical writers	Sch. of Tech.	55	44

category rating system that was converted into ranks by the researcher. The reported data, however, does suggest that students rate occupations higher in status that are associated with their field. Field, in this case, is the college of the student and the occupations that are associated with the college.

Occupational Awareness

Of the 318 students who responded to the survey used in this study, all but twenty-three of the students indicated a career choice upon completion of their education. Nine of the students listed more than one career choice. Table XI provides a complete listing of the occupational choices of the survey respondents. Engineering was listed most often, thirty times, as a possible career by the students surveyed. Kindergarten and elementary school teaching was mentioned as a career choice by twenty-eight of the students. Twenty occupations were listed twice and thirty occupations were named only one time as possible career selections.

Of the twenty-three students that did not list an occupational choice, the following class breakdown was made: freshmen, six; sophomores, eight; juniors, four; and seniors, five. This indicates that the undecided students were fairly well divided among each of the classes.

One of the six response categories on the survey sheet allowed for the students to choose "not familiar." This category, as provided in the directions to the respondent, was for: ". . . occupations that you do not have enough familiarity with to make an evaluation." All occupations that were rated "not familiar" by more than five percent of the students surveyed were considered by the researcher as having a low

TABLE XI
OCCUPATIONAL CHOICES OF THE SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Occupation	Number	Occupation	Number
Engineer	30	Secretary (unspecified)	2
Kindergarten and elementary school teacher	28	Speech therapist	2
Secondary school teacher	26	Agricultural education	2
Engineering and science technician	25	Banking (unspecified)	2
Business management	13	College teacher	1
Accountant	12	Computer programmer	1
Special education teacher	9	Draftsmen	1
Architect	8	Elementary school librarian	1
Veterinarian	8	Elementary school principal	1
Fashion merchandising	7	Florist	1
Military service	7	Free lance artist	1
Lawyer	6	Geologist	1
Marketing research worker	6	Geophysicist	1
Forester	5	High school counselor	1
Advertising	4	Historian	1
Agriculture (unspecified)	4	Humanities (unspecified)	1
Counseling (unspecified)	4	Insurance (unspecified)	1
Dentist	4	Insurance salesman	1
Dietitian	4	Juvenile corrections	1
Rancher	4	Legal secretary	1
Social worker	4	Mechanical contractor	1
Construction management	3	Museum personnel (unspecified)	1
Interior designer	3	Music education	1
Medical laboratory worker	3	Novelist	1
Newspaper reporter	3	Nutritionist	1
Psychologist	3	Personnel manager	1
Agricultural economist	2	Physicist	1
Agronomist	2	Policework	1
Aviation (unspecified)	2	Registered nurse	1
Dental hygienist	2	Research (unspecified)	1
Executive secretarial administrative	2	Seminary	1
Extension agent	2	Singer	1
Farmer	2	Wildlife manager	1
Finance	2	Zoologist	1
Fire protection	2	Undecided	23
Home economist (unspecified)	2		
Hotel manager	2		
Journalist	2		
Landscape architect	2		
Optometrist	2		
Physician	2		
Public relations worker	2		

student awareness level. Of the ninety-four occupations that were assessed in the survey used in this research, thirty-nine careers were rated "not familiar" by more than five percent of the respondents.

Table XII presents a list of the occupations that were assessed in the survey used in this study and the percentages of the students that rated them "not familiar." Approximately two-fifths of the occupations that were evaluated in the survey were given a "not familiar" rating by more than five percent of the respondents. The occupations range from actuaries that was rated "not familiar" by eighty-one percent of the students to six occupations that were given a "not familiar" rating by six percent of the respondents. The mean "not familiar" score for each occupation was eight percent and the median was four percent. A complete listing of the "not familiar" percentages for each occupation that was evaluated in the survey may be found in Table II in this chapter.

The results in Table XII may be viewed in several different ways. The students were asked to use the "not familiar" category for careers that they did not have enough familiarity with to make an evaluation. A lack of familiarity with an occupation would seem to indicate that the students did not have an awareness of the occupation. Another possibility, however, is that the students may have perceived the occupation in terms of being a career for a college graduate and this may have increased the "not familiar" ratings. As an example, dancers were rated "not familiar" in seven percent of the ratings. It may be possible that some of the students had an understanding of what a dancer does in general, but they may not have been familiar with the preparation and work of a dancer with a college degree. In turn, this may have increased

TABLE XII
 OCCUPATIONS RATED "NOT FAMILIAR" TO MORE THAN
 FIVE PERCENT OF THE SAMPLE

Occupation	Percentage of the Sample Rating "Not Familiar"
Actuaries	81
Podiatrists	46
Cooperative extension service workers	34
Systems analysts	31
Range managers	29
Industrial traffic managers	24
Insurance underwriters	21
Technical writers	21
Geophysicists	19
Licensed merchant marine officers	18
Anthropologists	15
Life scientists	15
Food scientists	12
Occupational therapists	12
Osteopathic physicians	12
Purchasing agents	12
Sanitarians	11
Securities salesmen	11
Airline dispatchers	10
Geographers	10
Programmers	10
Marketing research workers	9
Flight engineers	8
Industrial designers	8
Soil scientists	8
Statisticians	8
Urban planners	8
Actors and actresses	7
Astronomers	7
Dancers	7
Personnel workers	7
Medical record librarians	7
Meteorologists	7
Chiropractors	6
Historians	6
Insurance claim examiners	6
Oceanographers	6
Soil conservationists	6
Speech pathologists and audiologists	6

the "not familiar" ratings for dancers and for other occupations such as actors and actresses.

Thirty-nine occupations were rated "not familiar" by more than five percent of the students who completed the survey. Forty-four careers were rated "not familiar" by more than five percent of the male respondents and thirty-five careers were given a "not familiar" rating by the female respondents. This indicates, for this section of the data analysis, that the women who responded to the survey had a somewhat greater occupational awareness than the men.

Another way of assessing the data that was obtained in the survey employed in this study is to consider the variance of the responses of the rating of each occupation. The standard deviation of the rating of each occupation indicates the extent of the range of the student responses over the five possible evaluation categories. The occupations with high standard deviations had the least amount of agreement and the occupations with low standard deviations had the most amount of agreement among the respondents. The average standard deviation for the occupational ratings was 21.29.

Table XIII indicates the occupations with the most extreme standard deviations of the occupations rated in the survey. The five occupations with the highest standard deviations and the five occupations with the lowest standard deviations are presented. A complete listing of the standard deviations of all the occupations evaluated in the survey is reported in Table I in this chapter.

In Table XIII, the five occupations with the highest standard deviations indicate the careers that received the least amount of agreement among the student ratings. The occupations received ratings that were

spread among the five evaluation categories in the survey used in this study. Table II, in this chapter, presents the exact spread of the ratings. As an example from that table, actors and actresses received the following ratings: High, 16 percent; Above Average, 29 percent; Average, 27 percent; Below Average, 19 percent; and Low, 19 percent. With the percentages spread among the categories, a high standard deviation resulted.

TABLE XIII
EXTREME STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF
RATED OCCUPATIONS

Occupation	Highest Standard Deviations	Occupation	Lowest Standard Deviations
Actors and actresses	30.21	Technical writers	18.84
Chiropractors	28.19	Marketing research workers	18.40
Psychologists	25.61	Occupational therapists	17.87
Osteopathic physicians	25.22	Securities salesmen	17.20
Actuaries	25.00	Personnel workers	16.52

In contrast to the occupations with high standard deviations were those with the lowest standard deviations. These occupations in Table XIII indicate the careers that had the highest amount of agreement of the evaluations by the respondents to the survey. The spread of the ratings were constricted among the five evaluation categories. As an example from Table II, in this chapter, personnel workers received the following ratings: High, less than 1 percent; Above Average, 6 percent; Average, 63 percent; Below Average, 26 percent; and Low, 5 percent. A

low standard deviation resulted for personnel workers due to the high percentages of the responses in two of the categories. The vocational counseling implications of the standard deviations of the occupations will be discussed in Chapter V of this study.

Summary

The information presented in this chapter is from the data that was derived from the survey used in this investigation. The perceptions of the social status of the occupations evaluated were found to be similar among the students surveyed. The students were categorized by college, class, grade point average, and sex. The correlation coefficients of the occupational social status ranks within the student variables were all found to be significant at the .01 level. Differences of the ratings of specific occupations within the student variables were discussed.

The presence of occupational ego-centrism was assessed for students preparing to work in a specific occupation. Support of occupational ego-centrism for people training for a career was provided by an analysis of the data from the survey. In addition, students who attend a particular college tended to give a higher social status rating to careers related to the college.

The occupational awareness of the students that completed the survey was evaluated. The occupational choices that the students named on their survey sheets were reported. Careers that were listed on the survey sheet that were "not familiar" to over five percent of the respondents were analyzed. Finally, the variance of the ratings of the occupations considered in the survey were discussed.

The next chapter will present a general summary of the study, the findings and conclusions, and the implications of this investigation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

General Summary of the Investigation

This study was developed on the assumption that students are able to evaluate occupations for social status. Support for this assumption was provided by a review of the empirical studies of occupational social status in Chapter III of this study. Most of the studies had a small number of occupations ranked by varied groups of people. The high reliability of the social status rankings of occupations, among the studies reviewed, supports the position that individuals have consistent measurable perceptions of the status of occupations.

In an effort to contribute to the information available on the social status of occupations and to provide useful information for counseling, this study was conducted. A total of ninety-four careers were evaluated in the survey used in this research. The careers were selected in order to provide a representative group of occupations that college graduates often enter. The respondents to the survey were college students who were randomly selected from a stratified population of college and class. Upon the return of the survey sheets, the students were further classified by grade point average and sex.

Analysis of the data was conducted in three main areas. First, correlations were completed among the student variables of college, class

grade point average, and sex. Relationships were reported and tests of significance were applied to the correlation coefficients. The results of the statistical tests were related to the questions that were raised in the hypotheses of the study. Second, the presence of occupational ego-centrism was assessed among the careers that were listed in the survey and that were named as a career choice by five or more students. The mean ranking of an occupation evaluated by all of the respondents was compared with the mean ranking by the respondents preparing to work in the occupation. Third, the occupational awareness of the students was considered by reporting all careers that were rated "not familiar" by more than five percent of the respondents. A complete listing of the career choices of the students, that they indicated on the survey sheets, was also reported.

Findings and Conclusions

Summary of Hypotheses Testing

The first part of this section will discuss the rejection of the null hypotheses presented in Chapter I. The four hypotheses related to student perceptions of the social status of careers for college graduates. The four hypotheses and the findings are as follows:

1. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by students from the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Home Economics, and the School of Technology.

FINDING: The hypothesis was rejected for all of the colleges and the School of Technology. A significant relationship

exists between the social status rankings of students from each of the colleges and the School of Technology.

2. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior students.

FINDING: The hypothesis was rejected for all of the classes. A significant relationship exists between the social status rankings of students from each of the classes.

3. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by students with high and low grade point averages in each class.

FINDING: The hypothesis was rejected for students with high and low grade point averages. A significant relationship exists between the social status rankings of students with high and low grade point averages in each class.

4. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of the social status of careers by male and female students.

FINDING: The hypothesis was rejected for the male and female students. A significant relationship exists between the social status rankings of male and female students.

Summary of Occupational Ego-centrism

The second part of this section will discuss the applicability of occupational ego-centrism to students preparing to work in specific occupations and related fields. Occupations that were named as career choices by five or more students who responded to the survey used in this study and that were listed on the survey sheet, were used to assess

occupational ego-centrism. Of the ten occupations that met the specifications, all were found to be given higher ratings, on the average, by students who named them as career choices than by students in general.

The applicability of occupational ego-centrism to students preparing to work in related fields was assessed by considering the ratings of occupations associated with a college. Twenty-eight occupations that were evaluated in the survey were identified by the researcher as being associated with a particular college. Of the twenty-eight occupations, twenty-five of them were given a higher rating by students from the associated college over the average rating by students from the other colleges.

Summary of Occupational Awareness

The third part of this section will discuss the occupational awareness of the college students who completed the survey used in this study. A wide range of occupations were listed as career choices by the students who responded to the survey. Less than eight percent of the students did not indicate a career choice on the survey sheets. The undecided students were closely divided among all of the classes.

The ratings indicated that the students gave at least an average social status rating to the majority of the occupations surveyed. The largest percentage of the responses was in the "average" category with 43.8 percent and only 5.5 percent of the ratings were in the "low" category. This suggests that, although it was possible to construct a hierarchy of the social status ratings of the occupations, most of the occupations were perceived in a favorable manner by the students.

Of the ninety-four careers assessed in the survey, thirty-nine, or approximately two-fifths, of the occupations were rated as being "not

familiar" by more than five percent of the respondents. The mean "not familiar" score of each occupation was eight percent and the median was four percent. Thirty-five careers were given "not familiar" ratings by more than five percent of the female respondents and forty-four careers were given "not familiar" ratings by more than five percent of the male respondents.

The variance of the occupational ratings was limited for some occupations and broad for others. The standard deviation for the ratings for each occupation was 21.29 and the range of the standard deviations was from a high of 30.21 to a low of 16.52.

Conclusions

A general conclusion that this research produced was that the students have measurable perceptions of the social status of careers for college graduates. The results of this study indicated that the perceptions of the status of occupations were similar among the college students surveyed even when they were classified by college, class, grade point average, and sex. A clear social status hierarchy of careers for college graduates emerged from the survey ratings of the students. In addition, clusters of occupations formed within the social status hierarchy. As an example, scientific and health related careers were generally towards the top of the hierarchy and insurance occupations were at the bottom.

Students from six undergraduate colleges and a school of technology were found to perceive the social status of ninety-four careers for college graduates in a similar manner. The correlations between the rankings of the occupations among the colleges and the school of

technology were very high. There were some clear differences, however, in the evaluations of some occupations by students in each of the colleges. Students seem to give a higher rating to careers that may be associated or identified with their college. Further differences between the perceptions of students among the colleges may be due to the subject matter of the students, the type of student that attends a particular college, or other factors.

Students in each of the four classes were found to have similar perceptions of the social status of careers for college graduates. The students evaluated the ninety-four occupations in a closely related fashion. The strong similarities tend to obscure any differences in the evaluations, but for some specific occupations there were differences in how the careers were evaluated in each of the classes: freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior. One possible explanation, of several that may be suggested, for the differences between the perceptions of the students in each of the classes is the exposure to various occupations that students experience during their college years.

The perceptions of students with high and low grade point averages in each of the classes were found to be similar in evaluating the social status of careers for college graduates. High correlations were found between the occupational status rankings between students with high and low grade point averages. The correlations were not perfect, however, among both groups of students for each class. One explanation for the differences between the perceptions of students with high and low grade point averages may be attributed to the academic success of the students. Additional reasons may be suggested that offer more precise explanations for differences in the perceptions of the social status of occupations

of students with high and low grade point averages. However, the results of the comparisons emphasizes the similarities, not the differences, between the perceptions of the social status of careers by the college students.

Male and female students were also found to have similar perceptions of the social status of careers for college graduates. The similarity in the rating of the careers by the male and female respondents to the survey was indicated by the correlation coefficient of .96 between the two groups. Some differences were noted in the evaluations of the occupations by the male and female respondents, however. Women gave higher evaluations to almost every type of work. The social sciences and service careers in particular were given higher status ratings by women. Male students generally rated outdoor and scientific careers higher in status.

Based on the survey results, students often gave higher status ratings to the occupation that they are training for than the average rating of the career by all students. Occupational ego-centrism then seems to include not only people who are employed in careers but also individuals preparing to work in particular occupations. Occupational ego-centrism was also found to exist among students within the colleges. Students generally gave higher status ratings, on the average, to careers that were associated with the college that they attend.

The occupational awareness of the students who completed the survey was indeterminate. There was a low percentage of students who were undecided about a career; less than eight percent. Also, a broad range of occupations were mentioned as possible career choices by the students. At the same time, however, two-fifths of the occupations in the survey

were rated "not familiar" by more than five percent of the students. Eighteen of the ninety-four occupations assessed were given a "not familiar" rating by more than ten percent of the students. More men than women gave occupations the rating of "not familiar." Finally, although the results indicated a clear status hierarchy of careers for college graduates, the average standard deviation of the ratings of the occupations of 21.29 suggests that there is a certain amount of disagreement among the college students on the exact placement of any of the careers that were evaluated.

Implications

The results of this study holds implications for the vocational counselor and for the people that he serves. A clear status hierarchy of careers for college graduates emerged from this investigation. College students appear to have measurable perceptions of the prestige of careers. The vocational counselor should be aware of this in a counseling situation as he deals with the work value of prestige with his clients.

Social status rank orders of the ninety-four careers assessed in this study were established for the student variables of college, class, grade point average, and sex. The perceptions of the students, within each of the variables, of the social status of the careers were similar. Only by assessing specific careers in the rank order within each of the student variables was it possible to detect differences in the occupational social status perceptions of the students. As an example, women were found to give higher status ratings to almost all types of work and to social science and service occupations in particular. Men were found to give higher status ratings to scientific and outdoor careers.

The vocational counselor should recognize that students tend to give a higher status rating to careers that they are training for. In the present study, higher status ratings, on the average, were given by students to occupations that they were preparing to work in than by students who were not vocationally associated with the career. In addition, students tended to give a higher status rating, on the average, to careers that were associated with the college or school that they attended.

In making a career decision students are often influenced by their peers. In some cases the occupational information received from students preparing for a career or from students that are in a particular college may be biased. The counselor is in a position to provide an objective balance to such information.

By giving consideration to the social status of careers the occupational awareness of a person may be expanded. The results of this study indicated that two-fifths of the ninety-four careers assessed were "not familiar" to more than five percent of the students surveyed. This suggested a lack of occupational awareness on the part of the students and occupational information on careers for college graduates seems to be needed. Again the vocational counselor is in a position to assist students in obtaining such information. The results also indicated that fewer women than men used the category of "not familiar" on the survey sheet. This suggests that the women surveyed had a higher level of occupational awareness than the men who were surveyed.

There are also implications for further research as a result of this investigation. The same type of study could be completed utilizing different subjects and occupations. Students in junior and community

colleges could evaluate the social status of careers for graduates of two-year institutions. At the high school level, students could evaluate the social status of careers for high school graduates.

The present study could be improved by assessing the opinion of college students from different regions in the country in order to obtain a more representative viewpoint of college students. Increasing the numbers of students who participate in the study would also assist in substantiating the findings of the present study. The study could be strengthened by obtaining the opinions of the social status of careers from students from different types of institutions of higher education, beyond the large state university which was utilized in this investigation.

It would be useful in several years to replicate the present study. Changes in the perceptions of college students towards the social status of careers could be assessed. Trends and differences could be noted and the results of the present study could be brought up-to-date.

Careers for women could be assessed based on the basic information provided in this study. As more women enter occupations that formerly were almost exclusively held by men, changes in the social status of occupations may take place. If this study was replicated in several years, the perceptions of women towards occupations may be altered due to the fact that more women are presently entering careers previously dominated by males. The present study indicated a definite similarity between the perceptions of the social status of occupations by men and women, but this may be subject to change in the future.

The final implication for further study is that a comprehensive investigation of the substance of occupational prestige would be useful. As indicated in Chapter III of this study, a well conceived and carefully

executed investigation of the elements that contribute to the social status of occupations has not yet been published. The results of such a study would contribute to a better understanding of the work value of prestige.

Concluding Summary

This study assessed the college student perceptions of the social status of careers for college graduates. The perceptions of the students were found to be similar within the student variables of: college, class, grade point average, and sex. Only when specific occupations were assessed in the rank order of the careers within the student variables was it possible to assess differences in the social status perceptions of the careers among the college students.

The applicability of occupational ego-centrism to students preparing to work in specific careers was supported. Students also were found to give higher status ratings to occupations associated with the college or school that they attended. The occupational awareness of college students surveyed as a part of this study was found to vary. The students indicated a broad range of career choices and there was a low percentage of students who did not list an occupational choice. In the same survey, however, a large number of careers for college graduates were "not familiar" to a substantial number of students.

This investigation was conducted to assist vocational counselors, and the people that they serve, in the practice of vocational guidance. This objective will be reached if the information provided in this study is useful to individuals in making more satisfying career decisions.

Finally, it is hoped that this investigation will be of assistance to others who conduct further studies of the social status of occupations.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anastasi, A. Psychological Testing. 3rd ed. New York: MacMillan, 1969.
- Anderson, W. A. "The Occupational Attitudes and Choices of a Group of College Men." Social Forces, VI (1927), 278-283.
- Anderson, W. A. "The Occupational Attitudes and Choices of a Group of College Men." Social Forces, VI (1928), 467-473.
- Anderson, W. A. "Occupational Attitudes of College Men." Journal of Social Psychology, V (1934), 435-466.
- Baudler, L., and D. G. Paterson. "Social Status of Women's Occupations." Occupations, XXVI (1948), 421-424.
- Braun, J. S., and F. Bayer. "Social Desirability of Occupations: Revisited." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, XXI (1973), 202-205.
- Canter, R. R. "Intelligence and the Social Status of Occupations." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXIV (1956), 258-259.
- Cattell, R. B. "The Concept of Social Status." Journal of Social Psychology, XV (1942), 293-308.
- Caplow, Theodore. The Sociology of Work. New York: McGraw Hill, 1964. (Originally published: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.)
- Clack, R. J. "Occupational Prestige and Vocational Choice." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, XVI (1968), 282-286.
- Counts, G. S. "The Social Status of Occupations: A Problem in Vocational Guidance." School Review, XXXIII (1925), 16-27.
- Coutu, W. "The Relative Prestige of Twenty Professions as Judged by Three Groups of Professional Students." Social Forces, XIV (1936), 522-529.
- Crites, John O. Vocational Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.
- Davies, A. F. "Prestige of Occupations." British Journal of Sociology, III (1952), 134-147.
- Davies, K., and W. E. Moore. "Some Principles of Stratification." American Sociological Review, X (1945), 242-249.

- Deeg, M. E., and D. G. Patterson. "Changes in Social Status of Occupations." Occupations, XXV (1947), 205-208.
- Dolliver, R. H. "The High Status SVIB-M Occupations." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, XVI (1967), 119-124.
- Folsom, W. W., and E. L. Sobolewski. "Income and Social Status of Occupations." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVI (1957), 277-278.
- Form, W. H. "Toward an Occupational Sociology." Journal of Social Psychology, XXIV (1946), 85-99.
- Granger, S. C. "Psychologists Prestige Rankings of 20 Psychological Occupations." Journal of Counseling Psychology, VI (1956), 183-188.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. 4th ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 1965.
- Hakel, M. D., T. D. Hollman, and M. D. Dunnette. "Stability and Change in the Social Status of Occupations Over 21 and 42 Year Periods." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVL (1968), 762-764.
- Hakel, M. D., T. D. Hollman, and J. P. Ohnesorge. "Relative Influence of Prestige as a Determiner of Intelligence Judgments for Occupations." Journal of Vocational Behavior, I (1971), 69-74.
- Hall, J., and Caradog Jones, D. "Social Grading of Occupations." British Journal of Sociology, I (1950), 31-55.
- Hall, Richard H. Occupations and the Social Structure. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Haller, A. O., and I. W. Miller. The Occupational Aspiration Scale. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Schenkman, 1971.
- Haller, A. O., and A. Portes. "Status Attainment Processes." Sociology of Education, XLVL (1973), 51-91.
- Hartman, G. W. "The Prestige of Occupations." Personnel Journal, XIII (1943), 144-152.
- Hatt, P. K. "Occupation and Social Stratification." American Journal of Sociology, LV (1950), 533-545.
- Herrnstein, R. "Man's Search for the Good Life Is What Keeps Society Rolling." Sunday Oklahoman, November 18, 1973, 25.
- Hershenson, D. B. "Some Personal and Social Determinants of Occupational Role-taking in College Students." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XII (1965), 206-208.

- Hicks, R. E. "Two Zambian Studies." Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, IV (1971), 145-153.
- Hodge, R. W., P. M. Siegel, and P. H. Rossi. "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963." American Journal of Sociology, LXX (1964), 286-295.
- Hoppock, R. Occupational Information. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Inkeles, A., and P. H. Rossi. "National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige." American Journal of Sociology, LXI (1956), 329-339.
- Issacson, Lee E. Career Information in Counseling and Teaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Kondrasuk, J. N. "Graduate Students Ranking of Prestige Among Occupations in Psychology." Journal of Counseling Psychology. XVIII (1971), 142-146.
- Kunde, T. A., and R. V. Dawis. "Comparative Study of Occupational Prestige in the Three Western Cultures." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (1959), 350-352.
- Levin, M. M. "Status Anxiety and Occupational Choice." Educational and Psychological Measurement, IX (1949), 29-37.
- Menger, C. "The Social Status of Occupations for Women." Teachers College Record, XXIII (1932), 696-704.
- National Opinion Research Center. "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation." Opinion News, IX (1947), 3-13.
- Nietz, J. A. "The Depression and the Social Status of Occupations." Elementary School Journal, XXXV (1935), 456-461.
- North, C. C., and P. K. Hatt. "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation." Sociological Analysis. Eds. L. Wilson and W. L. Kolb. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1949, 464-473.
- Reiss, Albert J., Jr., et al. Occupations and Social Status. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- Roe, Ann. The Psychology of Occupations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1956.
- Rosenberg, M. Occupations and Values. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

- Simmons, D. D. "Children's Rankings of Occupational Prestige." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (1962), 332-336.
- Simpson, R. L., and I. Simpson. "Correlates and Estimation of Occupational Prestige." American Journal of Sociology, LXVI (1960), 135-140.
- Slocum, W. L., and R. T. Bowles. "Attractiveness of Occupations to High School Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (1968), 754-761.
- Smith, M. "An Empirical Scale of Prestige Status of Occupations." American Sociological Review, VIII (1943), 185-192.
- Spaeth, J. L. "Occupational Attainment Among Male College Graduates." American Journal of Sociology, LXXV (1970), 632-644.
- Steffle, B. "Analysis of the Interrelationships of Rankings of Occupations." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (1959), 435-438.
- Steffle, B., A. Resnikoff, and L. Lezotte. "The Relationship of Sex to Occupational Prestige." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (1968), 765-772.
- Stephens, E. W., N. D. Stevens, and D. L. Arnold. "What are the Attitudes of Students Toward Occupations." Journal of College Placement, XXVII (1966-1967), 27-29, 124-136.
- Stephenson, R. M. "Status Achievement and the Occupational Pyramid." Social Forces, XXXI (1952), 75-77.
- Stevens, R. B. "The Attitudes of College Women Towards Women's Occupations." Journal of Applied Psychology, XXIV (1940), 615-627.
- Stubbins, J. "The Relationship Between Level of Aspiration and Certain Personal Data: A Study of Some Traits and Influences Bearing on the Prestige Level of Vocational Choice." Genetic Psychology Monographs, XLI (1950), 327-408.
- Super, Donald E. The Psychology of Careers. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Super, D. E. The Work Values Inventory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.
- Super, D. E., and M. J. Bohn, Jr. Occupational Psychology. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1970.
- Taylor, Miller L. Occupational Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Thomas, L. G. The Occupational Structure and Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

- Thomas, R. M. "Reinspecting a Structural Position of Occupational Prestige." American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (1962), 561-565.
- Thomas, R. M., and Soeparman. "Occupational Prestige: Indonesia and America." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (1963), 430-437.
- Tuckman, J. "Social Status of Occupations in Canada." Canadian Journal of Psychology, I (1947), 71-74.
- Tuckman, J. "Rankings of Women's Occupations According to Social Status, Earnings and Working Conditions." Occupations, XXVIII (1950), 290-294.
- Tuckman, J. "Rigidity of Social Status Rankings of Occupations." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVI (1958), 534-537.
- Tyler, L. The Work of the Counselor. 3rd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.
- United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook for College Graduates, 1972-1973 Edition. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1972.
- United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1972-1973 Edition. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Welch, M. K. "The Rankings of Occupations on the Basis of Social Status." Occupations, XXVII (1948), 237-241.
- Zytowski, D. G. "An Exploration of the Prestige Values of College Majors." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, XV (1966), 46-49.

APPENDIX A

THE SURVEY USED IN THIS STUDY

SOCIAL STATUS OF CAREERS FOR COLLEGE GRADUATES

Personal Data

Grade point average for all college courses: _____

Occupational choice upon completion of education: _____

Directions

Listed below are ninety-four careers that often employ college graduates. Please choose the statement that best gives your opinion of the social status of each occupation as a career for a college graduate. Ratings of "Low," "Below Average," "Average," "Above Average," and "High," may be chosen. In addition, the category of "Not Familiar," may be used for occupations that you do not have enough familiarity with to make an evaluation. Put an "X" through the response that best represents your opinion.

	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Response</u>					
		Not Familiar	Low	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High
1.	Actors and actresses.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
2.	Systems analysts.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
3.	Geologists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
4.	Dietitians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
5.	Actuaries.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
6.	School counselors.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
7.	Architects.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
8.	Food scientists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
9.	Manufacturers' salesmen.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
10.	Airline dispatchers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
11.	Historians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
12.	Clergymen.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
13.	Sociologists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
14.	Registered nurses.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
15.	Foresters.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
16.	Geophysicists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H

Survey Number: _____

SOCIAL STATUS OF CAREERS FOR COLLEGE GRADUATES

	Not Familiar	Low	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High
17. Hotel managers and assistants.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
18. Range managers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
19. Accountants.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
20. Engineering and science technicians	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
21. Secondary school teachers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
22. Dancers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
23. Insurance claim adjusters.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
24. Physicians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
25. Biochemists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
26. Dentists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
27. Chemists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
28. College and university teachers....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
29. Engineers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
30. Advertising workers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
31. Economists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
32. Public relations workers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
33. Anthropologists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
34. Commercial artists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
35. Speech pathologists and audiologists	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
36. Librarians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
37. Osteopathic physicians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
38. Optometrists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
39. Lawyers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
40. Life scientists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
41. Career planning and placement counselors.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
42. Securities salesmen.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
43. Oceanographers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H

SOCIAL STATUS OF CAREERS FOR COLLEGE GRADUATES

	Not Familiar	Low	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High
44. Insurance agents and brokers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
45. Industrial designers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
46. Medical record librarians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
47. Geographers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
48. Astronomers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
49. Interior designers and decorators..	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
50. Musicians and music teachers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
51. Purchasing agents.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
52. Bank officers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
53. Home economists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
54. Employment counselors.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
55. Physical therapists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
56. Occupational therapists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
57. Singers and singing teachers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
58. Industrial traffic managers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
59. Pharmacists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
60. Physicists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
61. Statisticians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
62. Draftsmen.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
63. Kindergarten and elementary school teachers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
64. Rehabilitation counselors.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
65. Social workers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
66. Medical laboratory workers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
67. Recreation workers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
68. Personnel workers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
69. Insurance underwriters.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
70. Podiatrists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H

SOCIAL STATUS OF CAREERS FOR COLLEGE GRADUATES

	Not Familiar	Low	Below Average	Average	Above Average	High
71. Urban planners.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
72. Programmers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
73. Technical writers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
74. FBI special agents.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
75. Sanitarians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
76. Licensed merchant marine officers..	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
77. Landscape architects.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
78. Marketing research workers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
79. Psychologists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
80. Insurance claim examiners.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
81. Soil scientists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
82. Hospital administrators.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
83. Mathematicians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
84. Political scientists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
85. City managers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
86. Pilots and copilots.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
87. Newspaper reporters.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
88. Cooperative extension service workers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
89. Veterinarians.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
90. Flight engineers.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
91. Dental hygienists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
92. Meteorologists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
93. Chiropractors.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H
94. Soil conservationists.....	NF	L	BA	A	AA	H

Check here if you would like a copy of the results of this survey_____

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO THE SURVEY USED IN THIS STUDY

Dear Student:

Your name has been randomly selected for completing a survey of the social status of careers for college graduates. Enclosed is a survey sheet that can be completed in about ten minutes. This survey is designed to improve the effectiveness of career counseling and placement of college students. The number associated with your survey is for follow-up purposes only. Individuals will not be identified in the results, insuring the confidentiality of your reply.

Included is a stamped and self-addressed envelope that we hope you will use when returning the survey sheet through the U.S. Mail. We would be very appreciative if you could return the survey sheet as soon as possible, setting one week as a possible return date. If you would like a copy of the results of this survey, please check the space provided on the last page of the survey sheet.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Cordially,

/s/ J. H. Boggs

J. H. Boggs
Vice President for Academic
Affairs

/s/ Arthur J. Clark

Arthur J. Clark
Researcher

APPENDIX C

OCCUPATIONS LISTED IN THE CONTENTS OF THE
OCCUPATIONAL OUTLOOK FOR
COLLEGE GRADUATES

CONTENTS

- Business administration and related professions
 - Accountants
 - Advertising workers
 - Bank officers
 - Hotel managers and assistants
 - Industrial traffic managers
 - Marketing research workers
 - Personnel workers
 - Public relations workers
 - Purchasing agents
- Clergymen
 - Protestant ministers
 - Rabbis
 - Roman Catholic priests
- Conservation occupations
 - Foresters
 - Range managers
- Counseling occupations
 - Employment counselors
 - Rehabilitation counselors
 - School counselors
- Engineering
 - Aerospace
 - Agricultural
 - Biomedical
 - Ceramic
 - Chemical
 - Civil
 - Electrical
 - Industrial
 - Mechanical
 - Metallurgical
 - Mining
- Health service occupations
 - Physicians
 - Osteopathic physicians
 - Dental hygienists
 - Dentists
 - Registered nurses
 - Optometrists
 - Pharmacists
 - Podiatrists
 - Chiropractors
 - Occupational therapists
 - Physical therapists
 - Speech pathologists and audiologists
 - Medical laboratory workers
 - Medical record librarians
- Dietitians
- Hospital administrators
- Sanitarians
- Veterinarians
- Insurance occupations
 - Agents and brokers
 - Claim examiners
 - Underwriters
- Mathematics and related fields
 - Mathematicians
 - Statisticians
 - Actuaries
- Natural sciences
 - Environmental sciences
 - Geologists
 - Geophysicists
 - Meteorologists
 - Oceanographers
 - Life sciences
 - Life scientists
 - Biochemists
 - Physical sciences
 - Chemists
 - Physicists
 - Astronomers
 - Food scientists
- Performing arts
 - Actors and actresses
 - Dancers
 - Musicians and music teachers
 - Singers and singing teachers
- Other art-related occupations
 - Commercial artists
 - Industrial designers
 - Interior designers and decorators
- Social sciences
 - Anthropologists
 - Economists
 - Geographers
 - Historians
 - Political scientists
 - Sociologists
- Teaching
 - Kindergarten and elementary school teachers
 - Secondary school teachers
 - College and university teachers

Technician occupations
 Engineering and science
 technicians
 Draftsmen

Writing occupations
 Newspaper reporters
 Technical writers

Other professional and related
 occupations
 Airline dispatchers
 Architects
 City managers
 Career planning and placement
 counselors
 Cooperative extension service
 workers
 FBI special agents
 Flight engineers
 Home economists
 Landscape architects
 Lawyers
 Librarians
 Licensed merchant marine
 officers
 Manufacturers' salesmen
 Systems analysts
 Pilots and copilots
 Programmers
 Psychologists
 Recreation workers
 Securities salesmen
 Social workers
 Soil scientists
 Soil conservationists
 Urban planners

VITA ²

Arthur John Clark

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE SOCIAL STATUS OF CAREERS BY COLLEGE STUDENTS

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Quincy, Massachusetts, October 28, 1944, the son of Arthur Thomas and Margaret Louise Clark.

Education: Attended grade and high school in Quincy, Massachusetts. Graduated from North Quincy High School in Quincy, Massachusetts, in June, 1962; received the Associate of Science degree from Quincy Junior College, in June, 1964; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Eastern Nazarene College, with a History major, and Education and Literature minors, in May, 1966; received the Master of Education degree from Boston College, with a major in Secondary School and College Counselor Education, in September, 1970; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University, with a major in Student Personnel and Guidance, in May, 1974.

Professional Experience: Served as a personnel officer in the United States Army, June, 1966 to April, 1969; employed as a guidance counselor at Holbrook Junior High School in Holbrook, Massachusetts, 1970-1972; appointed as a graduate assistant at Oklahoma State University, 1973-1974.

Organizations: American Personnel and Guidance Association, American College Personnel Association, National Vocational Guidance Association, and the Oklahoma Personnel and Guidance Association.