

EMPLOYMENT QUALIFICATIONS FOR TEACHING FASHION MARKETING  
IN POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

by

DANA PATRICE RENDER

B.S., Kansas State University, 1974

---

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Clothing, Textiles and Interior Design

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1976

Approved by:

*Theresa A. Perenich*  
Major Professor

**THIS BOOK  
CONTAINS  
NUMEROUS PAGES  
WITH THE ORIGINAL  
PRINTING BEING  
SKEWED  
DIFFERENTLY FROM  
THE TOP OF THE  
PAGE TO THE  
BOTTOM.**

**THIS IS AS RECEIVED  
FROM THE  
CUSTOMER.**

LD  
2668  
T4  
1976  
R44  
C.2  
Document

113

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses her appreciation to committee members Dr. Floyd Price and Dr. Ruth Hoeflin for their interest and helpful suggestions. Special appreciation is extended to the author's major professor, Dr. Theresa Perenich, for her encouragement and guidance throughout the development of this thesis.

Appreciation is also given to those administrators who took the time to answer the questionnaire. Without their willingness to participate, this thesis would not have been possible.

To Dr. Arlin Feyerherm and Paulette Johnson, acknowledgment is given for their suggestions during the preparation of the questionnaire and assistance in the statistical analysis of the data.

Finally, special appreciation is extended to the author's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Richard A. Render, for their financial assistance, understanding and maintenance of morale.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	1
OBJECTIVES.....	2
DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	4
ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE.....	4
FACULTY SELECTION AND RECRUITMENT.....	5
TEACHING QUALIFICATIONS.....	5
Academic Degree.....	6
Major Academic Area and Supporting Coursework.....	8
Academic Employment.....	9
Outside Work Experience.....	10
MAIL SURVEY.....	10
III. PROCEDURE.....	13
DEVELOPMENT AND PRETEST OF QUESTIONNAIRE.....	13
SELECTION OF SAMPLE.....	14
ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	15
IV. FINDINGS.....	17
CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDING ADMINISTRATORS.....	17
RANKING OF EMPLOYMENT QUALIFICATION CRITERIA.....	20



	Page
RATINGS OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF QUALIFICATIONS.....	27
Work Experience.....	27
Area of Academic Study.....	31
Previous Academic Employment.....	32
Highest Degree Earned.....	36
Supporting Coursework.....	40
SUMMARY.....	42
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	47
LITERATURE CITED.....	51
APPENDICES.....	56
A. Questionnaire.....	57
B. Mailing List of Institutions.....	60
C. Letter of Inquiry.....	65
D. Inquiry Postcard.....	67
E. Cover Letter to Administrators.....	69
F. Cover Letter to Administrative Offices.....	71
G. Follow-Up Postcard.....	73
H. Regions Designated by The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education.....	75
I. Rankings of the Major Employment Criteria.....	77
J. Modified Contingency Tables of Rankings of the Major Employment Criteria.....	83
K. Overall Ratings of the Types of Employment Qualifications....	86
L. Modified Contingency Tables of Ratings of the Types of Employment Qualifications.....	90
ABSTRACT.....	99

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Characteristics of Administrators.....	19
2. Ranking of Employment Criteria in Order of Importance.....	22

## Chapter I

### INTRODUCTION

#### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Fashion marketing curriculums have interesting dual functions. They are well integrated in the academic curriculums of home economics in both universities and four-year colleges. Also, they are well suited as vocational curriculums in distributive education at community junior colleges and business colleges.

As a part of either type of curriculum, fashion marketing appears to be maintaining, if not expanding, its academic popularity. The home economics area of clothing and textiles, of which fashion marketing is a part, will need as many as 148 new teaching positions filled by 1976 to adequately handle curriculum demands (35). A number of sources also indicates that technical vocational curriculums including distributive education have been widely adopted by community junior colleges (22,34,37,41). A study by the Nebraska Occupational Needs Research Coordinating Unit indicated that out of 26 suggested distributive education curriculums, fashion marketing was the most desired by graduating high school seniors. The same study also revealed that distributive education teachers believed apparel and accessories courses are the most needed for their curriculums (24).

Qualified instructors are needed by various institutions for fashion marketing curriculums. An essential element in the recruitment

of these instructors is to communicate the qualification requirements for employment (42). Professional qualification requirements are important because the teaching faculty, in part, determines the success or failure of educational institutions in meeting their stated goals (28).

Any information concerning needed competencies for employment can help insure properly prepared teachers in several ways. First, this information may be employed in the selection of future faculty members, or the information may be used as a standard for present faculty which they can achieve through inservice training. The information may also aid in identifying training needs for future teacher preparation (24).

There appear to be no standard teacher qualification requirements. Qualifications may differ by type of institution (2,39,43); by the size of the institution (9,16); and by the size of a particular department (29). By comparing general instructor qualifications of similar institutions in California (26) and Texas (40), it appears that requirements also differ according to geographic regions. Instructor qualifications may also differ by academic disciplines (6,43).

Although there have been some detailed studies on employment qualifications desired in several different academic areas (12,14,19,32, 33,38), there have been only a few studies conducted for home economics (5,8). No research directed toward fashion marketing instructors was available.

## OBJECTIVES

This research had the following objectives:

- 1) to investigate the employment qualifications for teaching

fashion marketing preferred by administrators in various post-secondary institutions, and

2) to compare those preferred qualifications on the basis of the type of administrator preferring them.

#### DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

Administrator: Deans of colleges, deans of faculty, instruction, or academic affairs, and department chairmen

Junior or Community Colleges: Both public and private two-year colleges offering technical and semi-professional programs and college transfer programs

Four-year Colleges: Institutions which offer four years of education beyond high school and award Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees

Universities: Institutions composed of a number of colleges or schools which grant both bachelor's and graduate degrees

Large Institutions: Institutions which have 7,500 or more students

Small Institutions: Institutions with less than 7,500 students

Large Departments: Departments with five or more faculty members (full-time equivalency)

Small Departments: Departments with less than five instructors (full-time equivalency)

## Chapter II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

The organizational structure of academic institutions varies by the type of institution. For universities, the academic organization is a campus of decentralized schools or colleges which seek their own faculty and curriculums. The schools or colleges are further segmented by divisions or academic departments which are a collection of specific faculty expertise. Academic departments can vary in size from one instructor to more than 100 (1).

The liberal arts college organization can be simple because of its typically small size and unified function. The president often assumes the most responsibility in staff concerns, unless there is an additional level of organization such as dean of faculty. The dean of faculty would then have the responsibilities of staff affairs with the president's consultation (44). The four-year college may be segmented into academic departments.

Community junior college organizational structure can be very similar to four-year colleges and are organized into departments with department heads. Other two-year colleges are divided into divisions headed by a division chairman. Some community colleges do not have departmental organizations and all faculty are directly responsible to an academic dean such as a dean of faculty or dean of instruction (21).

## FACULTY SELECTION AND RECRUITMENT

A potential faculty member may be evaluated by any or all of the following: faculty committee, department head, dean, president, and board of trustees (18). The actual recruitment and selection process will vary with specific institutions. The university president exerts some control over faculty appointments but has a more significant role in selecting administrative personnel (1). The four-year college and junior college presidents have a much more active part in the selection of faculty than the university president (21,44). If an academic dean is a part of the administrative structure, he shares the responsibility of faculty selection with both the president and department heads (21). Many authorities agree that the most influential administrative officer in recruiting activities of any type of institution is the department head or chairman (3,4,23). The department head is the faculty's main point of supervision in budget, academic duties, and personnel administration including faculty appointments (1,23).

## TEACHING QUALIFICATIONS

No academic preparation, degree or professional experience in itself qualifies an individual to teach effectively. Genuine interest and participation in professional activities are also necessary and reflect continuing growth. Though there are many types of competencies needed by prospective post-secondary instructors, the three major competencies essential for employment will be emphasized (22):

- 1) knowledge of subject matter in specialty (determined by academic degree and supporting courses)

- 2) competency in teaching (determined by previous teaching experience)
- 3) work experience in specialty.

#### Academic Degree

Studies done between 1961 and 1970 concerning the highest degree obtained by community junior college instructors indicated a ratio of 18:75:7 for bachelor's to master's to doctorate which remained fairly constant during this period (25). This ratio was also in accordance with recent studies describing current trends in employment qualifications of the teaching staff. Junior college hired more instructors with master's degrees than with other degrees (9). Ninety-four percent of the junior college administrators stated they would require a master's degree for any liberal arts instructors. However, 71 percent of the responding administrators said that a bachelor's degree or even less would be adequate for an instructor of applied arts if he had sufficient work experience in his specialty (20). Even though a degree less than a master's had been considered adequate for vocational educators, the ideal degree was still a master's.

Community junior colleges hired few doctorates and other persons with more specialized degrees (9). Junior college administrators believed that the doctorate specialized a person too greatly in one area. Therefore, the person would not be satisfied in teaching basic courses and would not be pleased with an institution giving little or no support for research or publication (36). Many administrators agreed, however, that advanced coursework was desirable if it was geared toward improving one's teaching skills. A number of persons have suggested



that an intermediate degree between a master's and a doctorate be established (6).

The percentage of university and college faculty holding professional degrees or doctorates increased between 1968 and 1973. The 1973 statistics indicated that 45 percent of the faculty held a master's degree while 43 percent held professional degrees or doctorates (17).

Another survey of 2433 institutions by the American Council on Education determined that 35.3 percent of four-year college faculty held doctorates compared to 43 percent of university faculty which held the same degree (2). While many independent colleges did not demand a doctorate, many universities commonly required new faculty to possess this degree (31). Four-year colleges placed more stress on teaching than research and were not as interested in a PhD. which required specialization and research (44). The PhD. which was a more realistic requirement for research oriented universities was held by a higher percentage of faculty in large universities than by faculty in small universities (16).

A study of higher institutions in the South indicated a slight trend for the size of the department to increase as the percentage of instructors with less than a master's degree increased. As the size of the department increased, the proportion of teachers with three or more years of graduate study tended to decrease (29).

When comparing junior colleges to universities to colleges, four-year colleges had a larger percentage of higher degrees than junior colleges (39). However, universities had substantially more doctorates and fewer master's and bachelor's degrees than any other type of educational institution (43).

### Major Academic Area and Supporting Coursework

Common academic backgrounds of faculty differ according to the type of institution employing them. Faculty with a major academic area in the sciences and professions would most likely be employed by universities which had a variety of majors and specialized in research. Faculties with major areas in art and humanities were often employed by four-year colleges which mainly emphasized liberal arts. Backgrounds in education were common for faculty in community junior colleges (2).

For employment in junior colleges, coursework either supporting or in addition to the instructor's specialized field was most desirable when it improved the instructor's teaching skill (2). The ability of a faculty member to teach several related fields was highly desirable to junior college administrators (15). Therefore, selected undergraduate and graduate courses should be broadly based and not narrowly specialized if one is interested in junior college employment. Another possible way of increasing one's teaching skills was to include courses in education and curriculum. The course needed by prospective community college instructors pertained to the philosophy and goals of a two-year college. A study in 1974 indicated that only 17 percent of the full-time faculty at junior colleges had taken any courses specifically related to junior colleges (9).

On the college level, less than one-fourth of department chairmen insisted upon one particular specialty for possible employment. Rather than seeking one particular specialist, department heads typically sought a specialist in one of several areas (4).

Universities tended to demand faculty with additional training in research skills. This was in accordance with current emphasis on

university research programs particularly with funded projects (42).

### Academic Employment

Teaching experience was the most flexible of all employment qualifications. All types of institution regarded teaching experience as less important than other qualities of a prospective instructor (4). In general, however, the community college was the type of institution which most often stressed competency in teaching.

A national survey of institutions of higher education indicated that 28 percent of the faculty had previous college level teaching while 17 percent previously had been students with no full-time teaching experience. The majority of the faculty, however, reported a variety of academic employment such as precollege teaching, administration in various areas, and research (2).

Studies conducted between 1961 and 1974 concerning the previous employment of junior college faculty indicated that public schools were the most common sources of community college faculty. Business and industry was the second most common source. Of the instructors selected from business and industry, most were employed to teach applied arts (30). The increasing importance of business and industry as a source of community college instructors indicated that work experience was considered as important if not more important than teaching experience for technology educators. For academic areas, the percentage of new instructors with no previous teaching experience was very low (26).

Speculation that a trend will develop away from the recruitment of junior college faculty from four-year college and public school teaching staffs has occurred. This would create a trend toward hiring

instructors specifically prepared for junior college teaching by recruiting faculty members from staffs of other junior colleges or from graduate programs designed to prepare prospective teachers for community college employment.

In the employment criteria of four-year institutions, academic scholarship, professional achievement and research requirements were often times considered more important than teaching experience (18).

### Outside Work Experience

Practical experience within an instructor's occupational field enabled him to become a more competent teacher (27). Therefore, occupational experience was viewed by junior college administrators as being extremely important for an occupational instructor. Over 80 percent of full-time technical teachers had outside work experience while only 66 percent of junior college teachers as a whole had outside work experience (45). Colleges and universities were also beginning to employ a variety of professionals and technicians such as engineers, veterinarians, lawyers, and medical technicians for teaching career oriented majors (10). Typically the number of years experience preferred by administrators ranged from one to three years. However, the amount of outside work experience for present vocational instructors exceeded the requirements and averaged between two to five years. There was no indication of the level of responsibility of the job (13).

### MAIL SURVEY

The mail questionnaire is one method of collecting survey data. Mail surveys are often less costly and time consuming than other survey methods and offer a wider distribution for responses. Mail surveys also

offer a chance for both truthful and thoughtful replies through centralized control and interviewer bias seems to occur less frequently (11).

Surveying the total population can, however, be too time consuming or costly. Therefore, most mail surveys are based on a sample representative of that population (7). Factors determining the required sample size include the type of sampling method and type of data analysis used, the variability of the sampled date, and the degree of precision desired. Considerations such as what percentage of response is expected and whether the subgroups within that sample are large enough for tabulation should be made. With all else equal, large samples are more accurate than small ones. However, a sample representative of its population is more important than a large sample since sample size does not offset bias (7). Causes of sample bias often involve the mailing list or frame. The frame may not be what it is represented to be; it may be incomplete or too old or have duplication of names within the list. The frame may also have been sold to others for surveys and promotions which would create bias and reduce responses (11).

Guidelines for effective mail questionnaires are: 1) avoid color stock which resembles junk mail, 2) have paper substantial enough for handling and not showing the printing on the reverse side, 3) use a printing method that looks professional, 4) use a layout that is easy to read, answer and tabulate, 5) do not crowd margins, 6) make directions understandable, and 7) introduce each new topic of questions logically and in appropriate sequence (7,11). In addition, each question should be essential to and appropriate for the research problem; unbiased and

not lead respondents to answer what is currently "socially desirable" or desired by the researcher; and worded in language used and understood by the subjects (7).

To increase the rate of return on mail questionnaires, the instrument should be short and easy to answer; be sponsored by a prestigious group; be sent to literate correspondents, and include a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return mailing. The correspondent must believe he is an important part of an interesting project. His enthusiasm should not be dampened by questions which strain his memory or request unnecessarily confidential information. A high degree of survey response can be elicited through a letter of transmittal accompanying the questionnaire and a "follow up" card sent a few weeks afterward. The former provides motivation by clarifying the purpose and importance of the survey and reduces resistance by promising anonymity of responses. The "follow up" card reminds the correspondent of the need for participation and provides an opportunity to request a duplicate questionnaire if the first copy was no longer available (7,11).

The importance of pretesting questionnaires and procedures was stressed by both Compton and Erdos. The pretesting should be of a sample similar to the one to be used in the major survey but on a much smaller scale. Results of the pretest are used to improve the questionnaire by eliminating misunderstandings and ambiguities. They are also used to revise data collection and analysis (7).

## Chapter III

### PROCEDURE

#### DEVELOPMENT AND PRETEST OF QUESTIONNAIRE

The questions for the survey were developed from a review of literature in the field, personal experience, and consultations with an administrator concerned with a fashion marketing curriculum. The questionnaire was designed to minimize the time necessary for response, thus encouraging the recipient of the instrument to reply.

The questionnaire contained three basic types of questions: those investigating the characteristics of the responding administrators, those investigating the administrators' rankings in the order of importance of five major employment criteria, and those investigating the administrators' ratings of the desirability of different types of employment qualifications possible for each of the five major criteria.

The questionnaire was reviewed by several faculty members and statisticians. Revisions were made and the resulting questionnaire was pretested with 12 institutions, two institutions from each of the six regions designated by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. Eight of the twelve institutions responded and their responses were used to judge the appropriateness and accuracy of the survey questions. Further revisions on the questionnaire were made before it was mailed to the other institutions involved in the study (Appendix A).

## SELECTION OF SAMPLE

For this study, the population consisted of administrators nationwide from post-secondary institutions who were involved in the recruitment and selection of the faculty teaching fashion marketing. The types of post-secondary institutions included in the study were universities, four-year colleges, and community junior colleges. Specialized institutions such as technical or vocational institutions or business colleges were not included.

It was difficult to select a sample which would be representative of the population since there was no complete list of post-secondary institutions which offered fashion marketing courses. Therefore, the nationwide mailing list for the study was obtained from the following sources: The College Blue Book: Degrees Offered by College and Subject (1975), The College Blue Book: Occupational Education (1975), and Home Economics Institutions Granting Bachelor's or Higher Degrees (1971) (Appendix B).

On January 28, 1976 a letter was mailed to the administrative offices of the institutions on the mailing list. The letter asked for the name of the administrator most involved with the institution's fashion marketing curriculum (Appendix C). This procedure was followed to generate a greater response rate by insuring that the questionnaire would be sent directly to the correct administrator. The names of other institutions within the vicinity which offered fashion marketing courses were also requested. This question was asked to insure that as many institutions as possible could be included in the study. The institutions' responses were collected by self-addressed, stamped post-



cards accompanying the letter (Appendix D).

Of the 221 institutions contacted 137 returned the postcard with the necessary information. Questionnaires with cover letters were sent directly to those administrators named by the institutions (Appendix E). Questionnaires were also sent to the administrative offices of the institutions which did not return the postcard. These questionnaires were accompanied with a request to have the survey delivered to the appropriate administrator (Appendix F). A total of 221 questionnaires were mailed on March 8, 1976.

On April 9, 1976 a "follow-up" postcard was mailed to thank those who responded for their valuable assistance and to encourage those who did not respond to answer the questionnaire without delay (Appendix G). A total of 132 questionnaires were received of which 91 were used in the final study. The majority of questionnaires which were discarded had been answered by faculty members who had no administrative duties which involved fashion marketing faculty. Other questionnaires were discarded because they were received too late, were incomplete, or were from a type of institution not included in the study.

#### ANALYSIS OF DATA

A descriptive analysis using numbers and percentages was applied to the questionnaire responses concerning the characteristics of the participating administrators. Administrator responses were also analyzed to determine the ranking in order of importance of the five major employment criteria. The possible rankings ranged from (1) the most important criterion to (5) the least important criterion. Chi-square analysis was used to determine if the ranking of the major

employment criteria differed significantly by certain administrator characteristics such as administrative position, type of institution, etc. The level of significance for this study was .10. Statistical analysis of homogeneity was made of the administrators' ratings on the specific types of qualifications possible within each of the major employment criteria. Scores ranging from essential to disqualifying were tabulated to record the administrators' opinions on the desirability of each specific type of employment qualification. Chi-square analysis was used to determine if the administrators' ratings of specific employment qualifications differed by certain administrative characteristics. The level of significance was .10.

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) program developed by the Statistics Department at North Carolina State University was used throughout the study. All data were computed through the Kansas State University Computing Center using an IBM 370 158 computer.

## Chapter IV

### FINDINGS

The findings of this study have been discussed in the three major areas: the characteristics of responding administrators, the administrators' rankings of the importance of major employment criteria for teaching fashion marketing, and the administrators' ratings of the desirability of the specific types of qualifications possible within the major employment criteria.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDING ADMINISTRATORS

Of the 91 administrators who responded to the questionnaire, 40 were from universities, 16 from four-year colleges, and 35 from community junior colleges. In terms of institutional size, 41 administrators were from institutions with less than 7,500 students while the remaining 50 were from larger institutions. Although there were five separate categories in the questionnaire, the respondents' answers on institution size were grouped for analysis. The complete list of all respondents by size of institution is included in Table 1, page 19.

Forty administrators responding to the questionnaire represented departments with fashion marketing courses which had less than five faculty members. Fifty-one administrators responding to the questionnaire represented departments consisting of five or more faculty members. Twenty-five of the 91 responding administrators represented departments which had fashion marketing courses but whose total faculty consisted of

less than 20 percent fashion marketing instructors. Thirty-three administrators had departments with more than 20 percent but less than 50 percent fashion marketing instructors, and 33 represented departments with over 50 percent fashion marketing instructors. Of the 91 respondents, 33 represented institutions whose fashion marketing courses were taught within business departments while 38 represented institutions with general home economics departments with fashion marketing courses. Twenty-eight administrators were from institutions which included fashion marketing courses within departments specializing in clothing arts such as clothing and textiles, fashion design, fashion marketing, etc. or any combination of these specialties.

Nineteen of the 91 administrators were deans of specific colleges or deans of academics, instruction, or faculty. Seventy-two administrators were department heads, chairmen or directors.

Although six regions listed by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (Appendix H) were used for the questionnaire, the respondents were grouped for analysis in the following manner: 24 administrators represented the North Central region, 12 represented the New England and Middle States regions, 24 represented the Northwestern and Western regions, and 31 represented the Southern region. The complete list of all respondents by region is included in Table 1.

TABLE 1: Characteristics of Administrators

Characteristic		Number of Administrators
Type of institution:	university	40
	college	16
	junior college	35
Size of institution:	500 students	5
	500-2500 students	14
	2500-7500 students	22
	7500-12,500 students	28
	12,500 and over	22
Department size:	1-4 faculty	40
	5 or more faculty	51
% of fashion marketing instructors:	0-.19	25
	.20-.49	33
	.50 and over	33
Type of department:	business	25
	general home economics	38
	clothing arts	28
Administrative position:	dean	19
	department head	72
Region:	North Central	24
	New England	6
	Middle States	6
	Northwestern	9
	Western	15
	Southern	31

## RANKINGS OF EMPLOYMENT QUALIFICATION CRITERIA

Of the 91 questionnaires used in the study, 3 incomplete questionnaires were discarded during the tabulation of rankings of employment criteria. By tabulating the responses of the remaining 88 questionnaires, the overall importance of each criterion was established. The frequency of administrator responses concerning each major criterion for each possible ranking is located in Appendix I. Table 2 illustrates the resulting overall ranking in order of importance of employment criteria. Work experience (other than academic) was most frequently considered the most important criterion by all responding administrators. The second most important criterion was the area of academic study. Ranked third was previous academic employment which was closely followed by the highest academic degree earned. The criterion considered the least important most often by administrators was the supporting coursework.

Comparisons were made to determine if the rankings from administrators with certain characteristics differed from the ranking obtained from the overall responses by categorizing responses from the 88 administrators. One such category separated administrator responses by type of institution: 1) universities and four-year colleges and 2) community junior colleges. Table 2 includes the ranking of employment criteria by type of institution. There was no difference between the ranking by junior college administrators and the overall ranking. However, the ranking by university and four-year college administrators did differ. The majority of four-year college and university administrators ranked the academic degree the most important criterion rather than work

experience. Work experience and area of academic study were considered second in importance.

TABLE 2: Ranking of Employment Criteria in Order of Importance

## Administrator Type

	Work Experience	Area of Academic Study	Previous Academic Employment	Academic Degree Earned	Supporting Coursework
OVERALL	1	2	3	4	5
University and college	2	3	4	1	5
Community college	1	2	3	4	5
Under 7,500 students	1	2	3	4	5
7,500 and over	1	2	3	4	5
1-4 faculty members	1	2	3	4	5
5 or more faculty	1	2	3	4	5
1-19% fashion marketing instructors	1	3	4	2	5
20%-49% FM instructors	1	2	3	4	5
50% or more FM instructors	1	2	3	4	5
Business department	1	2	3	4	5
General home economics	3	2	4	1	5
Clothing arts	1	2	3	4	5
Dean	1	2	3	4	5
Department head	1	2	3	4	5
North Central	1	2	3	4	5
New England and Middle States	1	3	4	2	5
Northwestern and Western	1	2	3	4	5
Southern	3	2	4	1	5

## Ranking

1 = Most important

5 = Least important



Chi-square analysis was used on the differences in criteria ranking of four-year and two-year institution administrators. By relating the type of institution to which the administrator belonged with the administrator's ranking of work experience, the chi-square value was significant at the .032 level (Appendix J). The data showed that community college administrators (62%) were more often concerned with work experience as the top criterion than university of four-year college administrators (32%). Relating the type of institution with the administrator's ranking of academic degree produced a chi-square value which was significant at the .011 level (Appendix J). This analysis indicated that four-year institution administrators more often ranked academic degree as the most important criterion while two-year institution administrators more often ranked academic degree as the least important criterion. Therefore, it appeared that the difference in the ranking of criteria between four-year and two-year institution administrators was affected by their differing opinions of the importance of work experience and academic degree as employment qualifications.

Subdivisions of administrators by size of their institution disclosed that administrators from both small and large institutions ranked employment criteria no differently from the overall ranking. The same results occurred when administrators were divided according to their department size (Table 2).

Administrators were also subdivided by the percentage of fashion marketing instructors employed within the departments containing fashion marketing courses. The rankings from the three subdivisions, i.e. less than 20 percent fashion marketing instructors, 20 to 49 percent fashion marketing instructors, and 50 percent or more of fashion

marketing instructors were considerably varied (Table 2). Administrators representing departments with less than 20 percent fashion marketing instructors differed from the overall ranking as the academic degree was the second most important criterion to them while it was fourth overall. Administrators representing departments with 20 percent but less than 50 percent fashion marketing instructors agreed with the overall ranking of all five major criteria. Administrators representing departments with at least 50 percent fashion instructors differed from the overall ranking by indicating that the area of academic study was the most important criterion and work experience was second.

Chi-square analysis was used on the differences in criteria rankings based on the ratio of fashion marketing instructors. In the relationship between the administrator's ranking of academic degree and the department's ratio of fashion marketing instructors, the chi-square value was significant at the .064 level (Appendix J). This analysis disclosed that the larger the percentage of fashion marketing instructors in the administrator's department, the more often the administrator considered the academic degree as one of the least important qualifications. It should be noted that seven of the ten administrators who represented departments with less than 20 percent fashion marketing faculty and who considered academic degree as the most important criteria were from universities. Six of the ten administrators whose departments consisted of at least 50 percent fashion marketing faculty and who deemed academic degree as the least important criteria were from community colleges. The over emphasis of institution types in each case could have considerable effect on the results of the analysis.

Administrators were also subdivided by the type of department in

which fashion marketing courses were taught. The three subdivisions used were business departments, general home economics departments, and departments specializing in a specific area such as clothing and textiles, fashion marketing, fashion design, etc. The subdivision of business departments included any type or combination of business departments excluding fashion marketing or fashion marketing and business. The subdivision of general home economics departments included any type or combination of general home economics departments excluding business and home economics. Administrators representing either business departments or departments specializing in clothing arts ranked the employment criteria similarly to the overall ranking. Administrators representing general home economics departments differed in their ranking from the overall by considering academic degree the most important criterion instead of fourth and work experience as third most important instead of first (Table 2).

Chi-square analysis was used on the differences in criteria ranking based on the type of department being represented. By analyzing the type of department with the ranking of work experience, the chi-square value was significant at the .034 level (Appendix J). This data showed that business and clothing arts departments (58% and 54% respectively) more often considered work experience the most important criterion than did administrators representing general home economics departments (26%). It should be noted that administrators who represented business departments and considered work experience the most important criterion were most often from universities. Administrators with general home economics departments who considered work experience the third most important criterion were most often from community junior

colleges.

By dividing the respondents into subdivisions according to their administrative positions. It was found that both deans and department chairmen ranked employment criteria similarly to the general rankings given overall (Table 2).

Administrators were also divided by the region in which their institution was located. Several of the regions were grouped for analysis. Administrators from the North Central, Northwestern, and Western regions ranked employment criteria the same as the overall ranking (Table 2). The administrators in the New England and Middle States regions ranked academic degree as the second most important criterion. The Southern administrators ranked academic degree as the most important employment criterion with work experience ranked as third (Table 2).

Chi-square analysis was used on the differences in criteria ranking by each region. By analyzing the regions and the ranking of academic degree, the chi-square value was significant at the .06 level (Appendix J). This comparison revealed that the administrators from the North Central, Northwestern, and Western regions most often considered academic degree one of the least important criteria, while administrators from the Southern region often considered academic degree as the most important criterion. The administrators of the Northwestern and Western regions were most often employed by community colleges while the Southern administrators were most often employed by universities.

By analyzing the regions in which the administrator was located and the administrator's ranking of the area of academic study, the chi-square value was significant at the .084 level (Appendix J). This analysis disclosed that the New England and Middle States administrators

tended to rank the area of academic study third in important while Southern administrators more often ranked it as second.

#### RATINGS OF SPECIFIC TYPES OF QUALIFICATIONS

The entire 91 questionnaires were used in analyzing the ratings of specific types of qualifications possible within the major employment criteria. By tabulating the responses of all administrators, the overall desirability of each specific qualification was established. The 91 responding administrators were divided into various categories and comparisons were made to determine if subgroups of certain administrator characteristics rated qualifications differently than subgroups of different characteristics. The categories used were type of institution, size of institution, department size, the percentage of fashion marketing faculty within the department, type of department, administrative position, and region.

##### Work Experience

Work Experience, the criterion most often considered first in importance, was represented by three specific types of experience: fashion retailing, fashion production, and fashion design. The majority of administrators considered both fashion production and fashion design experience as desirable but not mandatory. However, fashion retailing experience was considered essential by almost two-thirds of all administrators (Appendix K).

When administrator responses on types of work experience were subdivided into groups of different administrator characteristics, the responses were significantly different by type of institution and administrative position. An examination of the relationship between type of

institution and the desirability of fashion production experience, reveals a chi-square value significant at the .009 level (Appendix K). The majority of university administrators (85%) considered fashion production experience desirable but few considered it essential. Community junior college administrators were less consistent in their opinions. Approximately one-fourth considered fashion production as essential while one-fourth considered it as having no bearing on potential employment. The remainder considered fashion production desirable for employment. Therefore, though junior college administrators were less consistent in their opinions, they more often considered fashion production experience necessary for employment than the other institutional administrators.

In examining the relationship between the type of administrator's institution and the desirability of fashion design experience, it was found that the chi-square value was significant at the .05 level (Appendix L). Fashion design experience was considered desirable by administrators from all institutions. One-fourth of the junior college administrators deemed the fashion design experience essential which was a substantially greater response than university or college administrators. Thirty-one percent of college administrators considered fashion design experience as having no bearing on possible employment. Therefore, significantly more junior college administrators considered fashion design experience essential whereas four-year colleges more often considered it having no bearing.

An investigation of the relationship between the respondent's administrative position and the desirability of fashion design experience produced a chi-square value which was significant at the .093 level (Appendix L). Deans considered fashion design experience both

desirable and essential more often than department chairmen. Department chairmen more often considered the work experience as having no bearing on potential employment. It should be noted that the responses of deans may have been influenced by the fact that there were twice as many deans from junior colleges than universities responding to the questionnaire.

The number of years of work experience was divided into five categories: none, one to two years, three to seven years, eight to twenty years, and over 20 years. Although 47 percent of the 91 administrators did not respond to the question dealing with the lack of work experience, the majority of those administrators who responded viewed no fashion work experience as either undesirable or disqualifying. Forty percent of the administrators considered one to two years of work experience as essential and 21 percent considered three to seven years of experience as essential. Three to seven years of nonacademic employment was the category considered desirable most often by administrators (60%). One-third of the administrators did not respond to questions concerning work experience of eight years or more. One-third responded that both the categories of eight to twenty years and over twenty years of non-academic experience would have no bearing on possible employment (Appendix K). Therefore, the desirability of years of work experience increased until seven years and then lost its significance.

When administrator responses about years of work experience were subdivided into groups of different characteristics, it was determined that responses were significantly different by the percentage of fashion marketing instructors within the department, the size of the department, and the type of department where fashion marketing courses were taught.

An investigation of the relationship between the percentage of fashion marketing instructors within the department and the desirability of no work experience showed that the chi-square value was significant at the .033 level (Appendix L). Although there was a high rate of nonresponse which averaged 46%, the majority of administrators responding viewed no work experience as either undesirable or disqualifying. Eighteen percent of the administrators representing departments containing 50 percent or more fashion marketing faculty responded that a lack of work experience had no bearing on potential employment. This category has the highest percentage of "no bearing" responses. The analysis may have been influenced by administrators who represented departments composed of less than 20 percent fashion marketing faculty. These administrators were mostly from universities, large departments, and large institutions. However, the administrators of departments with 50 percent or more of fashion marketing faculty were, in turn, mostly from community colleges, small institutions, and small departments.

By analyzing the size of the department in which fashion marketing courses were taught with the desirability of three to seven years of work experience, the chi-square value was significant at the .026 level (Appendix L). From the chi-square analysis, it was determined that three to seven years of nonacademic employment were considered desirable and classed as essential more often in departments of five or more faculty than departments with fewer faculty members. The larger departments answering desirable or essential were mostly from universities and large institutions while departments with less than five faculty members were mostly from junior colleges.

An analysis of the desirability of three to seven years of



experience in relation to the type of department in which fashion marketing courses are taught produced a chi-square value significant at the .008 level (Appendix L). The analysis revealed that departments specializing in clothing arts (43%) considered three to seven years of non-academic employment necessary more often than business departments (20%) which deemed it essential more often than general home economics departments (05%).

A study of the relationship between the percentage of fashion marketing instructors within the department and the desirability of over 20 years of work experience revealed the chi-square value to be significant at the .032 level (Appendix L). This analysis showed a direct relationship between the decreasing percentage of nonresponses and the increasing percentage of undesirable responses.

#### Area of Academic Study

The area of academic study which was the employment criterion most often considered second in importance was represented by four specific types of academic areas: fashion marketing exclusively, fashion marketing and clothing and textiles, fashion marketing and home economics, and fashion marketing and business administration. In evaluating the responses of all administrators, it was found that academic study in fashion marketing was considered desirable less often than the study of two academic areas. An exclusively fashion marketing background was considered either undesirable or disqualifying by nearly one-third of the respondents. The other combinations of academic study were all deemed desirable. However, fashion marketing and business administration was considered essential slightly more often than fashion marketing and home economics. The academic areas of fashion marketing

and clothing and textiles were considered essential by the highest percentage of respondents (43%) (Appendix K).

When administrator responses on the desirability of different areas of academic study were divided by different administrator characteristics, it was determined that responses differed significantly only by the administrator's type of institution. The relationship of the type of institution and the desirability of fashion marketing and business administration was investigated. A chi-square value at the .05 level was obtained after the ratings of disqualifying, undesirable, and no bearing were collapsed into one group (Appendix L). The majority of administrators from any type of institution considered the combination as a desirable prerequisite for employment. An additional 28 percent of university administrators and 37 percent of community college administrators considered the academic background as essential. None of the college administrators considered it essential.

#### Previous Academic Employment

Previous academic employment, the employment criterion most frequently ranked third in importance by administrators, was subdivided into five specific employment possibilities: teaching at the secondary level or lower, graduate teaching assistantship, post-secondary teaching, graduate research assistantship, and post-secondary research. There were few negative responses for any of the possible types of academic employment. Also, none of the types of previous employment were considered essential by a substantial number of administrators with the exception of post-secondary teaching which elicited a 22 percent response rate for "essential." The vast majority of administrators considered the other types of previous employment as either desirable or having no

bearing. Teaching experience had more desirable responses than research employment (Appendix K).

When administrator responses about the desirability of different types of previous academic employment were divided by administrator characteristics, it was found that responses differed only by the size of the administrator's institution. The relationship between the size of the institution and the rating of previous post-secondary teaching experience produced a chi-square value significant at the .023 level (Appendix L). Although both sizes of institutions most often considered post-secondary experience desirable, 30 percent of institutions with over 7,500 students considered the experience essential while only 12 percent of the smaller institutions considered it essential.

The number of years of work experience was divided into five groups: none, one to two years, three to seven years, eight to twenty years, and over 20 years. Forty-seven percent of the 91 administrators did not respond to the question of the lack of previous academic employment. Of those who responded, 27 administrators considered the lack of previous experience as undesirable or disqualifying while 20 administrators considered it having no bearing as an employment prerequisite. The grouping of one to two years of academic employment was the only category considered to be essential by a substantial percentage of administrators (26%). Three to seven years of academic employment was the grouping considered desirable by the largest percentage of administrators (66%). Over one-third of the administrators did not respond to questions concerning academic employment of eight or more years. Eight to twenty years of experience was considered desirable by 31 percent of the administrators while 20 or more years of experience was considered

desirable by only 16 percent. Both categories had an increasing percentage of administrators who considered these categories as having no bearing on potential employment (Appendix K). Therefore, the desirability of years of previous academic employment increased until seven years and then lost its significance.

When administrator responses about years of academic employment were subdivided into groups of different administrator characteristics, the responses were significantly different by the percentage of fashion marketing instructors within the department, department size, and the administrative position of the respondents. In the relationship between the percentage of fashion marketing instructors within the department containing fashion marketing courses and the desirability of no previous academic employment, a chi-square value significant at the .064 level was found (Appendix L). Nearly two-thirds of the administrators representing departments of 20 to 49 percent fashion marketing faculty did not respond to the question. Those who responded were equally divided in determining whether the lack of previous employment had no bearing on possible employment or whether it was either undesirable or disqualifying. In addition, 43 percent of the administrators representing departments with 50 percent or more of fashion marketing instructors did not respond to the question. Administrators who responded were equally divided in the same manner as the previous category of administrators. Those representing departments with less than 20 percent fashion marketing instructors responded the most often against the lack of previous academic employment. Although nearly one-fourth did not respond, those who did responded either "undesirable" or "disqualifying" twice as often as those who responded "no bearing." The majority of administrators

representing departments with 50 percent or more fashion marketing faculty and who answered "no bearing" were from community colleges, small institutions, and small departments.

An analysis of the respondent's administrative position and his response toward the lack of previous academic employment produced a chi-square value significant at the .064 level (Appendix K). This question produced a large percentage of nonresponse from both deans (53%) and department heads (43%). Of those deans responding, the vast majority considered the lack of previous academic employment undesirable. The department heads who responded were less often concerned with the lack of previous employment. Twenty-seven percent responded "undesirable" or "disqualifying" and 26 percent responded "no bearing." The deans who considered no previous academic employment undesirable were most often from community junior colleges.

Chi-square analysis of the relationship between the size of the department and the desirability of three to seven years of previous academic employment produced a chi-square value significant at the .069 level (Appendix K). Seventy-six percent of administrators representing departments with five or more faculty members considered three to seven years of previous employment desirable and six percent considered it essential. Only one administrator representing departments with less than five faculty members considered three to seven years of previous employment essential, 53 percent considered it desirable and 20 percent considered it having no bearing. Apparently three to seven years of previous academic employment was considered desirable more often by administrators representing departments with five or more faculty. Those administrators representing smaller departments were less often

concerned with the attainment of three to seven years of academic employment as an employment qualification.

#### Highest Degree Earned

The fourth ranked employment criterion in order of importance, the highest academic degree earned, was represented by four different categories: less than bachelor's degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, and doctorate. In tabulating the responses of all the administrators it was found that less than a bachelor's degree was viewed as disqualifying by 45 percent of the administrators and undesirable by an additional 18 percent. The majority of the remaining administrators gave no response. A bachelor's degree was rated as essential by 20 percent of the administrators and rated as disqualifying by almost 30 percent. A master's degree was considered essential by 53 percent of the administrators and this was the highest response rate for the rating. The same factor was rated desirable by another 40 percent. A doctorate was rated essential by only four percent of the administrators but rated desirable by another 48 percent. The doctorate was never viewed unfavorably but it was considered to have no bearing on potential employment by one-fourth of the administrators (Appendix K).

When administrator responses about the criteria of highest degree earned were subdivided into groups related to different administrator characteristics, the responses differed significantly by the size of the administrator's institution, the type of institution, and by the region in which the institution was located. An analysis of the relationship between the size of the institution and the desirability of less than a bachelor's degree showed a chi-square value significant at the .055 level (Appendix K). Although there was a substantial percentage of nonresponse

from both sizes of institutions, the majority of both considered less than a bachelor's degree unfavorable. However, a larger percentage of administrators from institutions with 7,500 or more students (52%) than administrators from smaller institutions (36%) considered less than a bachelor's degree to be disqualifying. The majority of administrators representing institutions with 7,500 or more students were from universities while administrators representing small institutions were most often from junior colleges.

When the relationship between the type of institution and the desirability of less than a bachelor's degree was analyzed, the chi-square value was significant at the .002 level (Appendix L). Thirty-three percent of the university administrators did not respond to the question. Of those who did, all but 2 considered having less than a bachelor's degree disqualifying. Twenty percent of the junior college administrators considered less than a bachelor's degree as disqualifying with an additional 31 percent rating it undesirable. Twenty-six percent of the junior college administrators did not respond. A majority of negative responses were given by all institutional administrators. University administrators gave more negative responses than college administrators which in turn gave more negative responses than junior college administrators.

Analysis of the type of institution in relation to the responses toward the attainment of a bachelor's degree produced a chi-square value significant at the .001 level (Appendix L). A bachelor's degree was considered essential or desirable by 20 percent of university administrators, 24 percent of college administrators, and 68 percent of the junior college administrators. A bachelor's degree was rated as disqualifying

by 45 percent of university administrators, 39 percent of college administrators, and only six percent of the community college administrators. Therefore, it appeared that there was limited acceptance of a bachelor's degree by both university and college administrators but there was a fairly high acceptance by junior college administrators.

Analysis of the relationship between type of institution and the desirability of a master's degree produced a chi-square value significant at the .02 level after the ratings of undesirable and no bearing were collapsed (Appendix K). The vast majority of administrators of all institutions rated a master's degree as desirable if not essential. University administrators required a master's degree more often than college administrators who required the degree more often than junior college administrators.

A chi-square value significant at the .0001 level was obtained when the relationship between the type of administrator's institution and the response toward the obtainment of a doctorate was analyzed. Only four administrators from any institution ranked the doctorate as essential. However, a large percentage of university administrators (70%) and college administrators (63%) considered it desirable. Fifty-four percent of the junior college administrators considered a doctorate as having no bearing as an employment prerequisite.

The data obtained concerning the relationship between an administrator's region and his response toward less than a bachelor's degree gave a chi-square value which was significant at the .002 level after the rankings of essential and desirable were collapsed (Appendix L). The following regions are presented by the percentage of administrators responding that less than a bachelor's degree was disqualifying:



Southern (68%), North Central (46%), New England and Middle States (33%), and Northwestern and Western (21%). Twenty-five percent of the Northwestern and Western administrators considered a bachelor's degree having no bearing on employment. They were the only administrators which gave a "no bearing" response. However, the percentage of nonresponses ranged from 21 to 38 percent within each region.

In analyzing the region in which an administrator was located in relation to the response toward the obtainment of a bachelor's degree, a chi-square value significant at the .0003 level was found (Appendix L). The administrators from the Northwestern and Western regions were most often satisfied with a bachelor's degree as the highest degree earned. Twenty-one percent responded that a bachelor's degree was essential and an additional 42 percent rated it as desirable. The administrators from the Southern region were the most often unsatisfied with a bachelor's degree. Fifty-five percent of these administrators rated it as disqualifying.

When the relationship between the administrator's region and the response toward the desirability of a doctorate was analyzed, a chi-square value significant at the .003 level was obtained (Appendix L). Only the Southern administrators (12%) indicated that a doctorate was essential. These same administrators had the highest percentage of response for the desirability of a doctorate (68%). The Northwestern and Western administrators were least concerned with prospective employees having a doctorate. Half of the administrators considered that a doctorate would have no bearing on possible employment. In each chi-square analysis concerning regions, the majority of Southern administrators were from universities. The majority of Northwestern and Western

administrators were from community colleges.

### Supporting Coursework

Supporting coursework was the employment criterion most often considered the least important by administrators. This criterion was subdivided into three specific categories: courses on specific types of institution, principles of teaching courses and a thesis. There were few unfavorable responses about any of these supporting academic studies by the 91 administrators. Twenty percent of the administrators considered principles of teaching courses to be essential and an additional 53 percent considered them to be desirable. Fewer of the administrators considered courses on the specific type of institution essential (11%) or desirable (37%). Administrators were the least often concerned with the completion of a thesis. Only eight percent rate it essential and 46 percent responded that it had no bearing as an employment prerequisite (Appendix K).

When administrator responses about the employment criterion of past supporting coursework was related to different administrator characteristics, the responses differed significantly. The administrative position of the respondent, the type of institution and the size of the institution were the major differences. Analysis of the relationship between the respondents' administrative position and their responses on principles of teaching courses produced a chi-square value significant at the .058 level (Appendix L). Deans were closely divided in their opinion of whether principles of teaching courses should be essential (32%), desirable (32%), or having no bearing (36%). Department chairmen required principles of teaching courses less often than deans (17%) but also considered it having no bearing less often than deans (15%). The

majority of deans were from community junior colleges and the majority of department heads were from universities and large institutions.

In analyzing the relationship of the administrator's type of institution and the response on the completion of a thesis, a chi-square value significant at the .002 level was obtained (Appendix L). There was a trend for a larger percentage of university administrators (47%) than college administrators (38%), or junior college administrators (14%) to consider the completion of a thesis to be desirable. There was also a larger percentage of junior college administrators (74%) than college administrators (44%), than university administrators (23%) who considered a thesis to have no bearing on possible employment. Although university administrators most often considered a thesis desirable, only 15 percent considered it essential.

An analysis of the administrator's type of institution related to the desirability of courses on the administrator's specific type of institution produced a chi-square value which was significant at the .076 level (Appendix L). The nonresponses contributed partially to the chi-square significance. Thirty-five percent of the university administrators did not respond. However, there was also a trend for a larger percentage of junior college administrators (49%) than college administrators (38%) or university administrators (28%) to consider courses on specific institution types to be desirable.

The size of the department in relation to responses on the desirability of courses on specific types of institutions was analyzed. The data produced a chi-square value significant at the .027 level (Appendix L). Approximately 37 percent of the administrators from both large and small departments considered courses on specific types of institutions

as desirable. A larger percentage of administrators representing small departments (23%) than large departments (02%) considered this course essential. Administrators from large departments considered a course on their specific type of institution to have no bearing on employment more often than small department administrators.

#### SUMMARY

Of the 91 administrators whose responses were used in this study, 40 were from universities, 16 from four-year colleges, and 35 from community junior colleges. Twenty-five administrators represented business departments, 38 represented general home economics departments, and 28 represented clothing and related arts departments. Nineteen of the administrators were deans of college or deans of academics, instruction, or faculty. Seventy-two of the administrators were department heads or chairmen.

The administrators' overall ranking in order of importance of major employment criteria for teaching fashion marketing were as follows: first, work experience other than academic; second, area of academic study; third, previous academic employment; fourth, highest degree earned; and fifth, supporting coursework.

Comparisons were made of the general ranking determined by the overall responses and the various rankings of administrators with certain characteristics. Administrators representing both four-year institutions, general home economics departments, and the Northwestern and Western regions ranked work experience lower than the overall ranking of first. Administrators representing both four-year institutions, departments consisting of less than 20 percent fashion marketing

instructors, general home economics departments, and the New England and Middle States regions ranked the highest academic degree earned higher than the overall ranking of fourth. It should be noted that the majority of significant differences in rankings by department type, percentage of fashion marketing instructors within the department, and region were partially influenced by the large emphasis of either universities or community colleges within each category.

Fashion retail experience was considered an essential prerequisite to teaching employment by 65 percent of the administrators. Both fashion production and design experience were considered desirable by over two-thirds of the administrators. However, few administrators considered the experiences essential. Of those considering the experience essential, junior college administrators, especially deans, considered fashion production and fashion design experience essential more often than four-year institution administrators.

In investigating the years of work experience desired by administrators, it was found that at least one to two years of experience was most often required while three to seven years were considered the most often desirable. The desirability of years of experience decreased after seven years. There were a substantial number of nonresponses on the lack of work experience but those who responded viewed it as unfavorable toward possible employment. Administrators representing departments with less than 20 percent fashion marketing instructors were the most often concerned with the lack of work experience while those representing departments with 50 percent or more fashion marketing instructors were the least often concerned. Administrators who represented large departments and departments specializing in clothing arts most often required

three to seven years of work experience.

An exclusively fashion marketing academic background was less often desirable than was a background of two academic areas. The academic combination of fashion marketing with clothing and textiles was considered essential by the highest percentage of respondents. Fashion marketing and business administration was considered essential more often than fashion marketing and home economics. Community college administrators considered the background of fashion marketing and business administration essential more often than the four-year institution administrators.

Few responses were unfavorable toward any type of previous academic employment, however teaching experience was more often considered desirable than research experience. Previous post-secondary teaching was the only type of employment to elicit "essential" responses. A graduate teaching assistantship was considered desirable more often than teaching at secondary or lower levels. Administrators representing large institutions considered post-secondary teaching as essential more often than small institutions.

In evaluating the number of years of previous academic employment, one to two years of experience was most often essential while three to seven years was considered to be the most desirable. The desirability of years of academic employment decreased after the accumulation of seven years. There was a substantial number of nonresponses on the lack of previous academic employment; those who responded were equally divided as to whether it was undesirable or had no bearing on possible employment. Deans and administrators representing departments with less than 20 percent fashion marketing instructors were the most often con-

concerned with the lack of academic employment. Three to seven years of academic employment was considered desirable more often by administrators representing departments with five or more faculty while those administrators representing smaller departments were less often concerned.

Less than a bachelor's degree was considered by the majority of administrators to be undesirable; a bachelor's degree was considered more favorably. The master's degree had the highest percentage of "essential" responses (53%) and a high percentage of "desirable" responses (40%). A doctorate was required by only four percent of the administrators while 48 percent considered it desirable, and 25 percent responded that it had no bearing on possible employment. Administrators from small institutions, community colleges, and the Northwestern and Western regions were less stringently against bachelor's degrees or lower degrees than other administrators. Although the majority of all administrators considered a master's degree desirable, university administrators considered it essential more often than college or junior college administrators. Administrators from universities and the Southern region considered a doctorate desirable more often than the other administrators. Community college administrators and those from the Northwestern and Western regions were the least concerned about the obtainment of a doctorate.

Few responses were unfavorable about any type of supporting coursework. However, principles of teaching courses were most often considered both essential and desirable. Courses on the specific type of institution were considered next most desirable by administrators and the completion of a thesis concerned the administrators the least.

Department heads considered principles of teaching courses desirable more often than deans who varied widely in their opinions. Community college administrators and administrators representing small departments put emphasis on courses about their specific type of institution the most often. University administrators considered the completion of a thesis desirable more often than junior college administrators who considered that it had no bearing on possible employment.



## Chapter V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Administrator responses from the questionnaire were not distributed evenly by regions. The region in which an administrator was located made significant differences in the administrator's responses. However, the regions themselves appeared to be nonrepresentative of institutions. For example, several regions consisted of predominantly one type of institution and little of another. Responses on the whole were adequately distributed by the type of institution. The type of administrator's institution was believed to be the most distinguishing administrative characteristic. Therefore, the sample used for the survey was determined not to be a severe source of bias.

In evaluating the overall ranking of the five major employment criteria, work experience was most often considered by administrators to be the most important employment criteria. The importance of work experience could be expected because of the business oriented nature of a fashion marketing curriculum. Also, work experience is in congruence with a recent trend in orienting college education to job opportunities after graduation.

When administrators' rankings of employment were analyzed by different administrative characteristics, the rankings of work experience and academic degree varied the most widely among different respondents. Those respondents whose characteristics were common to universities tended to rank academic degree most important while those

respondents representing community colleges tended to rank work experience more important. The differences in responses could be linked to the different goals common to the institutions. Community colleges tend to be more vocationally oriented than universities while universities often have graduate programs which require faculty members with doctorates.

Fashion retailing was the type of work experience most often considered essential by administrators. The demand could be caused by the fact that the retailing programs are the most common ones in which the students enroll. Retailing vocations are those most commonly obtained after graduation.

Most of the data concerning the highest degree earned were similar to other surveys which were reviewed. The data on the desirability of a doctorate was not similar to other surveys since only a few administrators considered it essential. This type of response could be attributed to the scarcity of doctorates associated with the fashion field and institutions in which to obtain a doctorate in their field. More administrators may have desired doctorates but because there are few potential faculty members with such a degree, the degree would not be required.

Only a few respondents were unfavorable toward any type of previous academic employment. However, administrators more often desired previous academic employment similar to the position for which the prospective instructor would be applying. Administrators preferred teaching experience to research experience and post-secondary teaching to lower levels of teaching.

Administrators responded similarly on years of experience for

both work experience and academic employment. In each instance, some experience was almost necessary with three to seven years being the most desirable. The fact that the importance attached to both areas of experience decreased after eight years and particularly after 20 years could be due to the age factor involved with such experienced people.

Specialization in fashion marketing exclusively was less often desirable to administrators than specialization in both fashion marketing and a related area. This was particularly emphasized in the clothing and textiles area.

In reference to the types of supporting coursework, completion of a thesis was less often desirable to administrators than principles of teaching courses and courses about a specific type of institution. This response could have been affected by the low overall ranking of importance of the highest degree earned.

The type of institution represented by the administrator was concluded to be the most important in distinguishing differences in administrator responses. The other characteristics, however, appeared to affect differences in responses less directly. Whether one characteristic (i.e. regional location) was solely responsible for the differences in administrator responses or whether responses were influenced simultaneously by other hidden characteristics (i.e. types of institutions within that region) was difficult to conclude.

#### Recommendations for further research:

- 1) A more complete and accurate mailing list should be obtained to better eliminate possible sample bias within the survey.
- 2) Further analysis is recommended to investigate the effects of indirect administrator characteristics with other characteristics

which were singled out for analysis i.e. to test whether southern administrators were more stringent about academic degree earned because of their regional location or because the majority were representing universities.

3) The surveys should be directed toward department heads only. The effectiveness of the survey would not be diminished since the majority of administrators responsible for the selection of fashion marketing instructors were department heads.

4) Future surveys could also include other types of institutions such as vocational and technical institutions, business colleges, and fashion colleges.

5) Using this survey as a foundation, further research could be utilized to investigate whether the fashion marketing faculty currently employed in education institutions meet the qualifications desired by administrators.

6) Another possibility could be to investigate whether candidates for teaching positions meet the administrative specifications.

7) Finally, it is recommended that research on the desired qualifications of instructors be expanded to any of the academic disciplines.

## LITERATURE CITED

# LITERATURE CITED

1. Balderston, Frederick E. Managing Today's University. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.
2. Bayer, Alan E. Teaching Faculty in Academe: 72/73. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 080 517, August, 1973.
3. Benjamin, Harold, ed. Democracy in the Administration of Higher Education. 2d ed. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1972.
4. Brown, David G. The Market for College Teachers. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965.
5. Callsen, Margaret S. "An Identification of Professional Competencies Needed by Home Economics Who Are Part-Time Adult Educators." Unpublished PhD. dissertation, Kansas State University, 1974.
6. Christopher, Johnny L. Certain Aspects of the Teacher's Role in Wyoming Junior Colleges with Implications for Program Planning and Improvement. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 014 312, June, 1966.
7. Compton, Norman H. and Olive A. Hall. Foundations of Home Economics Research. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1972.
8. Courtney, E. Wayne. The Identification and Comparison of the Common Training Needs and Requirements for Teachers of Vocational Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 010 845, March, 1967.
9. Day, C. William. Professional Preparation and Experience of Instructors in Junior colleges and Technical Institutions. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 097 923, 1974.
10. Elkin, Sol M. and Thomas P. Gleason. "Recruiting Teachers from Adults Experienced in Other Fields," Improving College and University Teaching, XX (Spring, 1972), 130-131.
11. Erdos, Paul L. Professional Mail Surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.

12. Feck, Vincent Joseph. "Characteristics and Professional Competency Needs of Teachers of Agriculture in Two-Year Technical Institutions or Colleges in the United States." Unpublished PhD. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1971.
13. Forgery, George W. Survey Study of Selected Illinois Vocational Educational Personnel: Qualifications, Needs, Trends, and Implications. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 079 524, August, 1972.
14. Fortune, Mary Evelyn. "An Exploratory Study of the Personal and Professional Characteristics of Park and Recreational Educators in Colleges and Universities, 1968/1969." Unpublished EdD. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1970.
15. Gilbert, Marion. A Study of Community College Teachers-Training Programs in Selected Universities. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 104 491, 1971.
16. Gowin, D. B. and George Daigneault. The Part-Time College Teacher. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 031 663, 1961.
17. Grant, W. Vance. "Selected Characteristics of College Faculty Members." American Education, XXIX (November, 1973), 29.
18. Herge, Henry C. The College Teacher. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.
19. Kelley, Claude. "Qualifications Determining Selection and Promotion of College Teachers of Education." Unpublished EdD. dissertation, Indiana University, 1953.
20. Kovach, Robert V. "Which Degrees for Faculty." Community and Junior College Journal, XLIV (November, 1973), 30-31.
21. Landrith, Harold F. Introduction to the Community Junior College. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1971.
22. Larson, Milton E. "Articulating Technical Education, Work Experience and Teacher Education for Trade and Technical Teachers." Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, VIII (Summer, 1971), 11-18.
23. McVey, Frank L. and Raymond M. Hughes. Problems of College and University Administration. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State College Press, 1952.
24. Nebraska Occupational Needs Research Coordinating Unit. The Development of a Hierarchy of Need for Specialized Distributive Education Programs in Post-Secondary Schools in Nebraska. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 105 957, 1974.

25. O'Banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1972.
26. Phair, Tom S. Staffing Patterns in California Community Colleges: A 1974-1975 Overview. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100 445, 1974.
27. Prull, Richard W. and Philip S. Very. A Description and Evaluation of Vocational Teacher Training Programs in the State of Rhode Island. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 025 650, 1968.
28. Robinson, Clyde H. "Selection and Appointment of Faculty," Engineering Education, LXIII (December, 1972), 194-195, 198.
29. Scales, Eldridge E. Academic and Professional Preparation of Faculty in Higher Institutions of the South. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 031 154 1969.
30. Shell, Edwin Taylor. An Investigation of the Doctor of Arts Degree for the Junior College Instructor. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 031 199, May 1969.
31. Shyrock, Richard H., ed. The Status of University Teachers. Belgium: International Association of University Professors and Lecturers, 1961.
32. Stearley, Lincoln L. "A Study of the Professional Qualifications and Interests of the Teachers of Freshman and Sophomore Mathematics in the State-Supported Institutions of Higher Learning in Michigan." Unpublished EdD. dissertation, Indiana University, 1970.
33. Stauffer, John N. "Judgments of Liberal Arts College Teachers and Deans Regarding College Teacher Qualifications." Unpublished EdD. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1956.
34. Sugarman, Michael N. "The Training of Teachers for Post-Secondary Occupational Education," Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, XI (Winter, 1974), 57-64.
35. Swope, Mary Ruth. "Is There a Teacher Shortage In Our Colleges?" Journal of Home Economics, XCIV (December, 1972), 9-12.
36. Taylor, Anita. Can Community Colleges Survive the PhD. Glut? U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 088 548, October, 1973.
37. Trimpe, Adrian. "Distributive Education at the Post-Secondary Level," Business Forum, XXIII (January, 1969), 26-27.



38. Vairo, Philip D. "A Comparative Study of the Qualifications and Salaries of Teachers in Two-Year Colleges and Teachers Giving Instructions to Freshment and Sophomores in Four-Year Colleges in North Carolina." Unpublished EdD. dissertation, Duke University, 1963.
39. \_\_\_\_\_. Faculty Quality: A Challenge to the Community College. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 017 240, April, 1965.
40. Wallace, Kenneth J. and others. Faculty Status in Texas Public Community Colleges. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 097 046, 1974.
41. Wolansky, William D. "The Need and the Opportunity," American Vocational Journal, XLIV (September, 1969), 31-32.
42. Wolansky, William D. and John B. DuVall. "Implementing an Effective Faculty Recruitment System," Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, XII (Fall, 1974), 27-32.
43. Wurster, Stanley R. Community Junior College Faculty: Needs, Characteristics and Sources. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 036 294, 1969.
44. Woodburne, Lloyd S. Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
45. Yarrington, Rodger. New Staff for New Students: Educational Opportunity for All. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 089 803, 1974.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

## EMPLOYMENT QUALIFICATIONS FOR TEACHING FASHION MARKETING

## SECTION I:

Please answer the following questions based on your opinion of what constitutes desirable qualifications for teaching fashion marketing within your institution. Check the appropriate "rating box" for every item within each of the following questions.

ESSENTIAL: Necessary for initial employment

DESIRABLE: Useful but not essential for initial employment

NO BEARING: No effect on initial employment

UNDESIRABLE: Detrimental to initial employment

DISQUALIFYING: Negates possible employment

## 1. Work Experience Other Than Academic:

	essential	desirable	no bearing	undesirable	disqualifying
Fashion retailing					
Fashion production					
Fashion design					

## 2. Number Of Years Of Total Work Experience Other Than Academic:

	essential	desirable	no bearing	undesirable	disqualifying
None					
1-2 Years					
3-7 Years					
8-20 Years					
Over 20 Years					

## 3. Previous Academic Employment:

	essential	desirable	no bearing	undesirable	disqualifying
Teaching (secondary or lower)					
Graduate teaching assistant					
Teaching (post-secondary)					
Graduate research assistant					
Research (post-secondary)					

## 4. Number Of Years Of Total Academic Employment:

	essential	desirable	no bearing	undesirable	disqualifying
None					
1-2 Years					
3-7 Years					
8-20 Years					
Over 20 Years					

## 5. Highest Degree Earned:

	essential	desirable	no bearing	undesirable	disqualifying
Less than bachelor's					
Bachelor's degree					
Master's degree					
Doctorate					

## 6. Major Areas Of Academic Studies:

	essential	desirable	no bearing	undesirable	disqualifying
Fashion marketing & other clothing and textile area					
Fashion marketing & other home economics area					
Fashion marketing & business administration					
Fashion marketing exclusively					

## 7. Types Of Supporting Coursework:

	essential	desirable	no bearing	undesirable	disqualifying
Courses on your specific type of institution					
Principles of teaching courses					
Thesis					

## 8. Rank the following from 1 to 5 in order of importance as qualification criteria: (1 being the most important and 5 being the least important)

- Previous work experience other than academic \_\_\_\_\_  
 Previous academic employment \_\_\_\_\_  
 Type of highest degree obtained \_\_\_\_\_  
 Major area in academic studies \_\_\_\_\_  
 Type of supporting coursework \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION II:

Please answer the following questions based on the characteristics of your institution and department:

1. Type Of Institution? (Check One)
- University \_\_\_\_\_  
 Four-year college \_\_\_\_\_  
 Community junior college \_\_\_\_\_  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_
2. Size Of Institution? (Check One)
- Under 500 \_\_\_\_\_  
 500-2,500 \_\_\_\_\_  
 2,500-7,500 \_\_\_\_\_  
 7,500-12,500 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Over 12,500 \_\_\_\_\_
3. What total number of faculty is within the department in which fashion marketing courses are taught? (full-time faculty equivalency) \_\_\_\_\_
4. What number of faculty is specifically involved with fashion marketing courses? (full-time faculty equivalency) \_\_\_\_\_
5. Department in which fashion marketing courses are taught? \_\_\_\_\_  
name
6. Your administrative position? \_\_\_\_\_  
title

Please refold and staple the questionnaire for mailing. The back of the questionnaire is addressed and stamped. Thank you.

APPENDIX B

MAILING LIST OF INSTITUTIONS

## NEW ENGLAND

## Universities

University of Bridgeport  
 University of Vermont  
 University of Maine at Orono  
 University of Connecticut  
 University of Rhode Island

## Four-Year Colleges

Framington State College  
 Johnson and Wales College  
 Westbrook College  
 Thomas College  
 Husson College

## Two-Year Colleges

Bay Path Junior College  
 Endicott Junior College  
 Chamberlayne Junior College  
 Rhode Island Junior College  
 Middlesex Community College  
 Becker Junior College  
 Garland Junior College  
 Art Institute of Boston  
 Post College

## MIDDLE STATES

## Universities

University of Delaware  
 Syracuse University  
 Pennsylvania State University  
 University of Maryland  
 Carnegie-Mellon University  
 State University of New York at  
 Buffalo

## Four-Year Colleges

Immaculata College  
 College Misericordia  
 Hood College  
 Seton Hill College  
 Philadelphia College of Textiles  
 & Sciences  
 Pratt Institute

## MIDDLE STATES

## Two-Year Colleges

Peirce Junior College  
 Marie Regina College  
 Fashion Institute of Technology  
 Bennett College  
 Centenary College for Women

## SOUTHERN

## Universities

Tennessee University of Knoxville  
 University of Arkansas at Pine  
 Bluff  
 East Carolina University  
 Tuskegee Institute  
 North Texas State University  
 University of Montevallo  
 Texas Christian University  
 Louisiana Technical University  
 University of Georgia  
 Morehead State University  
 University of Kentucky  
 Virginia Polytechnical Institute &  
 State University  
 Texas Woman's University  
 North Carolina Agricultural and  
 Technical University  
 Florida State University  
 Stephen F. Austin State University  
 University of Texas  
 Texas Southern University  
 Houston State University  
 East Texas State University  
 Appalachian State University  
 Memphis State University  
 Texas Agricultural & Industrial  
 University  
 Texas Technical University  
 Northeast Louisiana University  
 University of Southern Mississippi  
 University of Houston  
 University of North Carolina  
 Florida Agricultural and Mechanical  
 University  
 Auburn University  
 Louisiana State University  
 University of Alabama

## SOUTHERN

## Universities

Baylor University

## Four-Year Colleges

Prairie View Agricultural &  
Mechanical College  
Hampton Institute  
Radford College  
Virginia State College  
Norfolk State College  
Georgia Southern College  
Saint Mary's Dominican College  
Bennett College  
Savannah State College  
Ambassador College  
Tennessee Technical College  
Southern University A & M College

## Two-Year Colleges

Palm Beach Junior College  
Sandhills Community College  
Utica Junior College  
Daytona Beach Community College  
Tarrant County Junior College  
Rockingham Community College  
Massey Junior College  
Greenville Technical College  
Miami-Dade Community College  
Sullins College  
Winslow College  
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College  
Art Institute of Atlanta  
King's College

## NORTH CENTRAL

## Universities

South Dakota State University  
North Dakota State University  
Eastern Michigan University  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Michigan State University  
Central Missouri State University  
University of Oklahoma  
Bowling Green State University  
University of Missouri  
Wayne State University  
Iowa State University of Science  
& Technology

## NORTH CENTRAL

## Universities

Ohio University  
Ohio State University  
Mankato State University  
University of Cincinnati  
Western Illinois University  
University of Nebraska  
Miami University  
University of Illinois  
Indiana State University  
University of Iowa  
University of Northern Iowa  
Arizona State University  
University of Arizona  
Colorado State University  
Kent State University  
University of Wisconsin-Stout  
Oklahoma State University  
University of Oklahoma  
University of Northern Illinois  
Cornell University

## Four-Year Colleges

Fontbonne College  
Kansas State College of Pittsburg  
Northwood Institute  
Columbia College  
Edgecliff College  
Mercy College of Detroit  
Mundelein College  
Rosary College

## Two-Year Colleges

Pima College  
Southern Ohio College  
Winston Churchill College  
Black Hawk College  
Northeast Oklahoma Agricultural  
& Mechanical College  
Hawkeye Institute of Technology  
Phoenix College  
Western Wisconsin Technical  
Institute  
Waukesha County Technical Institute  
Northeast Wisconsin Technical  
Institute  
Johnson County Community College  
Iowa Central Community College



## NORTH CENTRAL

## Two-Year Colleges

Madison Area Technical College  
 Gateway Technical Institute  
 Lakeshore Technical Institute  
 Western Wisconsin Technical  
 Institute  
 Kenosha Technical Institute  
 Kirkwood Community College  
 International Junior College  
 of Business  
 Moorehead Vocational School  
 Glendale Community College  
 Cuyhoga Community College  
 Dodge City Community College  
 Ellsworth Community College  
 District One Technical Institute  
 Community College of Denver  
 Fox Valley Technical Institute  
 William Rainey Harper College  
 Metropolitan Community College  
 University of Minnesota Technical  
 College  
 Mesa Community College  
 Dodge City Community College  
 Iowa Central Community College  
 Arapahoe Community College

## NORTHWEST

## Universities

Boise State University  
 Oregon State University  
 Montana State University  
 University of Washington  
 University of Idaho  
 Brigham Young University  
 Utah State University  
 University of Utah  
 Washington State University

## Four-Year Colleges

Eastern Washington State College

## Two-Year Colleges

Portland Community College  
 Everett Community College  
 Clackamas Community College

## NORTHWEST

## Two-Year Colleges

Highline Community College  
 Bellevue Community College  
 Shoreline Community College  
 Ricks College

## WESTERN

## Universities

San Diego State University  
 California State University-San  
 Jose  
 California State University-Chico  
 San Francisco State University  
 University of Hawaii

## Four-Year Colleges

California State College-Fresno  
 California State College-San  
 Francisco

## Two-Year Colleges

Fullerton Junior College  
 Pasadena City College  
 Los Angeles Trade Technical College  
 Modesto Junior College  
 Butte Junior College  
 Sacramento City College  
 Santa Rosa Junior College  
 Riverside City College  
 Long Beach City College  
 Kapiolani Community College  
 Butte Junior College  
 Kauai Community College  
 Honolulu Community College  
 Maui Community College  
 Fresno City College  
 American River College  
 Los Angeles Harbor College  
 Brooks College  
 East Los Angeles College  
 Reedley College  
 College of Alameda  
 Los Angeles Valley College  
 Bakersfield College  
 Marymount College  
 Bauder College

## WESTERN

## Two-Year Colleges

San Bernardino Valley College

Merritt College

San Joaquin Delta College

Mount San Antonio College

Eighty-nine of the institutions listed did not respond to the questionnaire. The institutions may not have had fashion marketing curriculums or may not have been a type of institution suitable for the study.

APPENDIX C  
LETTER OF INQUIRY



Department of Clothing, Textiles, and Interior Design  
Justin Hall  
Manhattan, Kansas 66506  
Phone: 913 532-6993

January 28, 1976

Good Morning,

A national survey sponsored by Kansas State University is being conducted among administrators of selected educational institutions. The purpose of this research is to explore the desired professional qualifications of fashion marketing instructors being considered for employment. To best meet this objective, it is necessary for the forthcoming questionnaire to be sent directly to the specific administrator who is involved in the recruitment and selection of instructors teaching fashion marketing and related courses.

I ask for your cooperation in completing the accompanying card with information concerning the administrator who would be best suited for this survey. For universities or four-year colleges, this administrator could be head of the department in which the fashion marketing courses are taught. For the two-year colleges, this administrator might be the Dean of Instruction or the specific division chairman who is concerned with fashion marketing courses.

Thank you very much for your cooperation since it determines the success of the survey.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Dana Render'.

Dana Render  
Graduate Student  
Dept. of Clothing, Textiles,  
and Interior Design

APPENDIX D  
INQUIRY POSTCARD

The administrator who  
is best suited for our  
forthcoming survey:

name

position

department

institution

Is there any institution  
in your vicinity which has  
included Fashion Marketing  
courses within the last  
several years?

institution

street

city

state

zip

APPENDIX E  
COVER LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS



Department of Clothing, Textiles, and Interior Design  
Justin Hall  
Manhattan, Kansas 66506  
Phone: 913 532-6993

March 8, 1976

Good Morning,

A national survey sponsored by Kansas State University is being conducted among administrators of selected educational institutions. The purpose of this research is to explore the opinions of yourself and your colleagues on the desired professional qualifications of fashion marketing instructors being considered for employment.

Your answers are very important to the accuracy of this research. Of course, all answers are confidential and will be used only in combination with those of other administrators.

If you are interested in receiving a report on the findings of this research, just write your name and address at the end of the questionnaire, or if you prefer, request the results in a separate letter. I will be glad to send you a complimentary report when it is completed.

Please return the completed questionnaire at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Dana Render'.

Dana Render  
Graduate Student  
Dept. of Clothing, Textiles,  
and Interior Design



APPENDIX F

COVER LETTER TO ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES



Department of Clothing, Textiles, and Interior Design  
Justin Hall  
Manhattan, Kansas 66506  
Phone: 913 532-6993

March 8, 1976

Good Morning,

A national survey sponsored by Kansas State University is being conducted among administrators of selected educational institutions. The purpose of this research is to explore the opinions of professional qualifications of fashion marketing instructors being considered for employment. Please forward this questionnaire to the administrator who is the most involved in the recruitment and selection of fashion marketing instructors.

Your institution's answers are very important to the accuracy of this research. Of course, all answers are confidential and will be used only in combination with those of other institutions.

If your institution is interested in receiving a report on the findings of this research, just write your name and address at the end of the questionnaire, or if you prefer, request the results in a separate letter. I will be glad to send you a complimentary report when it is completed.

Please return the completed questionnaire at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Dana Render'.

Dana Render  
Graduate Student  
Dept. of Clothing, Textiles,  
and Interior Design

APPENDIX G  
FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD

Good Morning.

Recently we mailed a questionnaire asking for your participation in an important survey. If you have already returned the questionnaire, please consider this a "thank you" for your valuable help.

If you have not had a chance to do so as yet, may we ask you to return the completed form today. Your participation is vital to the success of our study.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dana Render  
Kansas State University

APPENDIX H  
REGIONS DESIGNATED BY THE  
FEDERATION OF REGIONAL ACCREDITING COMMISSIONS  
OF HIGHER EDUCATION

## NORTH CENTRAL

Arkansas  
Arizona  
Colorado  
Illinois  
Indiana  
Iowa  
Kansas  
Michigan  
Minnesota  
Missouri  
Nebraska  
New Mexico  
North Dakota  
Ohio  
Oklahoma  
South Dakota  
West Virginia  
Wisconsin  
Wyoming

## NORTHWESTERN

Idaho  
Montana  
Nevada  
Oregon  
Utah  
Washington

## WESTERN

California  
Hawaii\*

## NEW ENGLAND

Connecticut  
Maine  
Massachusetts  
New Hampshire  
Rhode Island  
Vermont

## MIDDLE STATES

Delaware  
Maryland  
New Jersey  
New York  
Pennsylvania

## SOUTHERN

Alabama  
Florida  
Georgia  
Kentucky  
Louisiana  
Mississippi  
North Carolina  
South Carolina  
Tennessee  
Texas  
Virginia

\*included for the survey.

APPENDIX I  
RANKINGS OF THE MAJOR EMPLOYMENT CRITERIA

## ALL ADMINISTRATORS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	38	22	12	9	7
Academic Employment	9	20	30	19	10
Highest Degree Earned	21	14	12	22	19
Area of Academic Study	20	30	22	13	3
Supporting Coursework	4	10	11	21	42

## UNIVERSITIES AND 4-YEAR COLLEGES

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	17	15	11	7	4
Academic Employment	7	12	14	13	8
Highest Degree Earned	19	9	8	9	9
Area of Academic Study	12	20	12	9	1
Supporting Coursework	2	4	7	13	28

## COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	21	7	1	2	3
Academic Employment	2	8	16	6	2
Highest Degree Earned	2	5	4	13	10
Area of Academic Study	8	10	10	4	2
Supporting Coursework	2	6	4	8	14

## SMALL INSTITUTIONS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	14	10	5	6	3
Academic Employment	7	5	16	7	3
Highest Degree Earned	9	5	3	15	6
Area of Academic Study	7	16	10	2	3
Supporting Coursework	2	3	5	6	22



## LARGE INSTITUTIONS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	24	12	7	3	4
Academic Employment	2	15	14	12	7
Highest Degree Earned	12	9	9	7	13
Area of Academic Study	13	14	12	11	0
Supporting Coursework	2	7	6	15	20

## SMALL DEPARTMENTS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	15	13	4	4	3
Academic Employment	8	4	12	11	4
Highest Degree Earned	5	7	6	8	13
Area of Academic Study	13	13	9	3	1
Supporting Coursework	0	5	7	12	15

## LARGE DEPARTMENTS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	23	9	8	5	4
Academic Employment	1	16	18	8	6
Highest Degree Earned	16	7	6	14	6
Area of Academic Study	7	17	13	10	2
Supporting Coursework	4	5	4	9	27

## 0-19% FASHION MARKETING INSTRUCTORS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	12	5	4	3	0
Academic Employment	0	4	12	5	3
Highest Degree Earned	10	5	0	5	4
Area of Academic Study	2	10	7	5	0
Supporting Coursework	0	3	0	5	16

## 20-49% FASHION MARKETING INSTRUCTORS

Employment Criteria	Ranking				
	1	2	3	4	5
Work Experience	15	6	4	4	3
Academic Employment	5	10	8	4	5
Highest Degree Earned	7	5	6	10	4
Area of Academic Study	6	10	8	6	2
Supporting Coursework	3	2	5	7	15

## 50% OR MORE FASHION MARKETING INSTRUCTORS

Employment Criteria	Ranking				
	1	2	3	4	5
Work Experience	11	11	4	2	4
Academic Employment	4	6	10	10	2
Highest Degree Earned	4	4	6	7	11
Area of Academic Study	12	10	7	2	1
Supporting Coursework	1	5	6	9	11

## DEANS

Employment Criteria	Ranking				
	1	2	3	4	5
Work Experience	8	7	3	0	1
Academic Employment	2	7	5	5	0
Highest Degree Earned	3	2	2	10	2
Area of Academic Study	7	4	7	1	0
Supporting Coursework	1	1	1	2	14

## DEPARTMENT HEADS

Employment Criteria	Ranking				
	1	2	3	4	5
Work Experience	30	15	9	9	6
Academic Employment	7	13	25	14	10
Highest Degree Earned	18	12	10	12	17
Area of Academic Study	13	26	15	12	3
Supporting Coursework	3	9	10	19	28

## BUSINESS DEPARTMENTS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	14	6	2	1	1
Academic Employment	1	5	10	5	3
Highest Degree Earned	5	4	4	5	6
Area of Academic Study	6	8	5	4	1
Supporting Coursework	0	3	2	8	11

## HOME ECONOMICS DEPARTMENTS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	10	10	9	7	2
Academic Employment	7	7	11	9	4
Highest Degree Earned	11	7	3	8	9
Area of Academic Study	9	13	10	5	1
Supporting Coursework	3	4	4	9	18

## CLOTHING ARTS DEPARTMENTS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	14	6	1	1	4
Academic Employment	1	8	9	5	3
Highest Degree Earned	5	3	5	9	4
Area of Academic Study	5	9	7	4	1
Supporting Coursework	1	3	5	4	13

## NORTH CENTRAL REGION

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	9	8	4	0	2
Academic Employment	5	4	6	4	4
Highest Degree Earned	5	2	5	4	7
Area of Academic Study	5	9	5	4	0
Supporting Coursework	0	2	2	10	9

## NEW ENGLAND &amp; MIDDLE STATE REGIONS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	5	3	1	2	1
Academic Employment	2	3	2	4	1
Highest Degree Earned	3	3	1	3	2
Area of Academic Study	1	3	6	1	1
Supporting Coursework	1	0	2	2	7

## NORTHWESTERN &amp; WESTERN REGIONS

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	15	4	1	2	1
Academic Employment	0	8	10	3	2
Highest Degree Earned	0	6	2	9	6
Area of Academic Study	7	3	8	3	2
Supporting Coursework	2	6	2	4	9

## SOUTHERN REGION

Employment Criteria	1	2	Ranking 3	4	5
Work Experience	9	7	6	5	3
Academic Employment	2	5	12	8	3
Highest Degree Earned	13	3	4	6	4
Area of Academic Study	7	15	3	5	0
Supporting Coursework	1	2	5	5	17

APPENDIX J  
MODIFIED CONTINGENCY TABLES OF  
RANKINGS OF THE MAJOR EMPLOYMENT CRITERIA

## RANKING OF WORK EXPERIENCE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities & 4-Year Colleges	17 (32%)	15 (28%)	11 (20%)	7 (13%)	4 (07%)	54 (100%)
Community Colleges	21 (62%)	7 (20%)	1 (03%)	2 (06%)	3 (09%)	34 (100%)

p = .0313

## RANKING OF ACADEMIC DEGREE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities & 4-Year Colleges	19 (35%)	9 (17%)	8 (14%)	9 (17%)	9 (17%)	54 (100%)
Community Colleges	2 (06%)	5 (15%)	4 (12%)	13 (38%)	10 (29%)	34 (100%)

p = .0107

## RANKING OF ACADEMIC DEGREE BY RATIO OF FASHION MARKETING INSTRUCTORS

	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
0-19% FM Instructors	10 (42%)	5 (21%)	0 (00%)	5 (21%)	4 (16%)	24 (100%)
20-49% FM Instructors	7 (21%)	5 (16%)	6 (19%)	10 (31%)	4 (13%)	32 (100%)
50% + FM Instructors	4 (13%)	4 (13%)	6 (19%)	7 (22%)	11 (33%)	32 (100%)

p = .0631

## RANKING OF WORK EXPERIENCE BY TYPE OF DEPARTMENT

	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Business Departments	14 (58%)	6 (25%)	2 (09%)	1 (04%)	1 (04%)	24 (100%)
Home Economics Departments	10 (26%)	10 (26%)	9 (24%)	7 (19%)	2 (05%)	38 (100%)
Clothing Arts Departments	14 (54%)	6 (23%)	1 (04%)	1 (04%)	4 (15%)	26 (100%)

$p = .0340$

## RANKING OF ACADEMIC DEGREE BY REGION

	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
North Central	5 (22%)	2 (09%)	5 (22%)	4 (17%)	7 (30%)	23 (100%)
New England & Middle States	3 (25%)	3 (25%)	1 (08%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	12 (100%)
Northwestern & Western	0 (00%)	6 (26%)	2 (09%)	9 (39%)	6 (26%)	23 (100%)
Southern	13 (44%)	3 (10%)	4 (13%)	6 (20%)	4 (13%)	30 (100%)

$p = .0596$

## RANKING OF AREA OF ACADEMIC STUDY BY REGION

	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
North Central	5 (22%)	9 (39%)	5 (22%)	4 (17%)	0 (00%)	23 (100%)
New England & Middle States	1 (08%)	3 (25%)	6 (51%)	1 (08%)	1 (08%)	12 (100%)
Northwestern & Western	7 (30%)	3 (13%)	8 (35%)	3 (13%)	2 (09%)	23 (100%)
Southern	7 (23%)	15 (50%)	3 (10%)	5 (17%)	0 (00%)	30 (100%)

$p = .0840$

APPENDIX K

OVERALL RATINGS OF THE TYPES OF EMPLOYMENT QUALIFICATIONS



The columns in each of the following tables are labeled as follows:

- 0 No Response
- 1 Rating of Essential
- 2 Rating of Desirable
- 3 Rating of No Bearing
- 4 Rating of Undesirable
- 5 Rating of Disqualifying

#### RATINGS OF TYPES OF WORK EXPERIENCE BY ALL ADMINISTRATORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Fashion Retailing	0 (00%)	59 (65%)	31 (34%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Fashion Production	3 (04%)	13 (14%)	62 (68%)	13 (14%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Fashion Design	2 (02%)	12 (13%)	61 (67%)	16 (18%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)

#### RATINGS OF YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE BY ALL ADMINISTRATORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
None	43 (47%)	1 (01%)	2 (02%)	8 (09%)	20 (22%)	17 (19%)	91 (100%)
1-2 Years	15 (16%)	36 (40%)	32 (35%)	1 (01%)	6 (07%)	1 (01%)	91 (100%)
3-7 Years	11 (12%)	19 (21%)	55 (60%)	6 (07%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
8-20 Years	32 (35%)	0 (00%)	25 (27%)	28 (31%)	5 (06%)	1 (01%)	91 (100%)
Over 20 Years	31 (34%)	0 (00%)	16 (18%)	30 (33%)	10 (11%)	4 (04%)	91 (100%)

## RATINGS OF AREAS OF ACADEMIC STUDY BY ALL ADMINISTRATORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Fashion Marketing/ Clothing & Textiles	4 (05%)	39 (43%)	44 (48%)	2 (02%)	2 (02%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Fashion Marketing/ Home Economics	7 (08%)	19 (21%)	51 (56%)	12 (13%)	2 (02%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Fashion Marketing/ Business Adminis.	4 (05%)	24 (26%)	56 (62%)	5 (05%)	1 (01%)	1 (01%)	91 (100%)
Fashion Marketing Exclusively	21 (23%)	5 (05%)	23 (25%)	14 (15%)	26 (29%)	3 (03%)	91 (100%)

## RATINGS OF TYPES OF ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT BY ALL ADMINISTRATORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Secondary or Lower	15 (16%)	4 (04%)	36 (40%)	32 (35%)	4 (04%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Graduate Teaching Assistant	18 (20%)	1 (01%)	43 (47%)	28 (31%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Post-Secondary Teaching	5 (05%)	20 (22%)	61 (67%)	5 (05%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Graduate Research Assistant	20 (22%)	1 (01%)	25 (27%)	44 (48%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Post-Secondary Research	21 (23%)	1 (01%)	30 (33%)	38 (42%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)

## RATINGS OF YEARS OF ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT BY ALL ADMINISTRATORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
None	41 (45%)	1 (01%)	2 (02%)	20 (22%)	20 (22%)	7 (08%)	91 (100%)
1-2 Years	17 (19%)	24 (26%)	44 (48%)	2 (02%)	3 (04%)	1 (01%)	91 (100%)
3-7 Years	14 (15%)	4 (05%)	60 (66%)	12 (13%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
8-20 Years	32 (35%)	0 (00%)	28 (31%)	39 (32%)	2 (02%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Over 20 Years	32 (35%)	0 (00%)	15 (15%)	35 (38%)	7 (08%)	2 (02%)	91 (100%)

## RATINGS OF ACADEMIC DEGREES EARNED BY ALL ADMINISTRATORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Less Than Bachelor's	25 (27%)	1 (01%)	2 (02%)	6 (07%)	16 (18%)	41 (45%)	91 (100%)
Bachelor's Degree	17 (19%)	18 (20%)	18 (20%)	3 (03%)	9 (10%)	26 (29%)	91 (100%)
Master's Degree	4 (04%)	48 (53%)	36 (40%)	2 (02%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Doctorate	20 (22%)	4 (04%)	44 (48%)	23 (25%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)

## RATINGS OF TYPES OF SUPPORTING COURSEWORK BY ALL ADMINISTRATORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Course on Specific Institution	18 (20%)	10 (11%)	37 (37%)	28 (31%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Principles of Teaching	6 (07%)	18 (20%)	48 (53%)	18 (20%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)
Thesis	11 (12%)	7 (08%)	30 (33%)	42 (46%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	91 (100%)

APPENDIX L

MODIFIED CONTINGENCY TABLES OF

RATINGS OF THE TYPES OF EMPLOYMENT QUALIFICATIONS

## RATING OF FASHION PRODUCTION EXPERIENCE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities	0 (00%)	4 (10%)	34 (85%)	2 (05%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	40 (100%)
4-Year Colleges	1 (06%)	0 (00%)	12 (75%)	3 (19%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	16 (100%)
Community Colleges	2 (05%)	9 (26%)	16 (46%)	8 (23%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	35 (100%)

p = .0088

## RATING OF FASHION DESIGN EXPERIENCE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities	0 (00%)	3 (08%)	31 (78%)	6 (15%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	40 (100%)
4-Year Colleges	1 (06%)	0 (00%)	10 (63%)	5 (31%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	16 (100%)
Community Colleges	1 (03%)	9 (26%)	20 (57%)	5 (14%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	35 (100%)

p = .0480

## RATING OF FASHION DESIGN EXPERIENCE BY ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Deans	0 (00%)	4 (21%)	15 (79%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	19 (100%)
Department	2 (03%)	8 (11%)	46 (64%)	16 (22%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	72 (100%)

p = .0927

## RATING OF NO WORK EXPERIENCE BY % OF FASHION MARKING INSTRUCTORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
0-19% FM Instructors	8 (32%)	1 (04%)	0 (00%)	1 (04%)	10 (40%)	5 (20%)	25 (100%)
20-49% FM Instructors	18 (55%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	1 (03%)	7 (21%)	7 (21%)	33 (100%)
50% + FM Instructors	17 (52%)	0 (00%)	2 (06%)	6 (18%)	3 (09%)	5 (15%)	33 (100%)

p = .0327

## RATING OF 3 TO 7 YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE BY DEPARTMENT SIZE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Under 5 faculty	6 (15%)	7 (17%)	21 (53%)	6 (15%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	40 (100%)
5 or more faculty	5 (10%)	12 (24%)	34 (66%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	51 (100%)

p = .0254

## RATING OF 3 TO 7 YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE BY DEPARTMENT TYPE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Business Departments	2 (08%)	5 (20%)	17 (68%)	1 (04%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	25 (100%)
Home Economics Departments	6 (16%)	2 (05%)	25 (66%)	5 (13%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	38 (100%)
Clothing Arts Departments	3 (11%)	12 (43%)	13 (46%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	28 (100%)

p = .0073

RATING OF MORE THAN 20 YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE BY % OF FM INSTRUCTORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
0-19% FM Instructors	4 (16%)	0 (00%)	4 (16%)	9 (36%)	5 (20%)	3 (12%)	25 (100%)
20-49% FM Instructors	10 (30%)	0 (00%)	7 (21%)	11 (34%)	5 (15%)	0 (00%)	33 (100%)
50% + FM Instructors	17 (52%)	0 (00%)	5 (15%)	10 (30%)	0 (00%)	1 (03%)	33 (100%)

p = .0312

RATING OF FASHION MARKETING/BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities	0 (00%)	11 (28%)	25 (63%)	2 (05%)	1 (02%)	1 (02%)	40 (100%)
4-Year Colleges	1 (06%)	0 (00%)	13 (81%)	2 (13%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	16 (100%)
Community Colleges	3 (09%)	13 (37%)	18 (51%)	1 (03%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	35 (100%)

p = .0500

RATING OF POST-SECONDARY TEACHING EXPERIENCE BY INSTITUTION SIZE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Small Institution	2 (05%)	5 (12%)	29 (71%)	5 (12%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	41 (100%)
Large Institution	3 (06%)	15 (30%)	32 (64%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	50 (100%)

p = .0226

## RATING OF NO ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT BY % OF FASHION MARKETING INSTRUCTORS

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
0-19% FM Instructors	6 (24%)	1 (04%)	0 (00%)	6 (24%)	8 (32%)	4 (16%)	25 (100%)
20-49% FM Instructors	21 (64%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	6 (18%)	4 (12%)	2 (06%)	33 (100%)
50% + FM Instructors	14 (43%)	0 (00%)	2 (06%)	8 (24%)	8 (24%)	1 (03%)	33 (100%)

p = .0636

## RATING OF NO PREVIOUS ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT BY ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Deans	10 (53%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	1 (05%)	8 (42%)	0 (00%)	19 (100%)
Department Heads	31 (43%)	1 (01%)	2 (03%)	19 (26%)	12 (17%)	7 (10%)	72 (100%)

p = .0634

## RATING OF 3 TO 7 YEARS OF ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT SIZE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Under 5 Faculty	9 (23%)	1 (02%)	21 (53%)	8 (20%)	1 (02%)	0 (00%)	40 (100%)
5 Or More Faculty	5 (10%)	3 (06%)	39 (76%)	4 (08%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	51 (100%)

p = .0689

## RATING OF LESS THAN BACHELOR'S DEGREE BY SIZE OF INSTITUTION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Small Institution	10 (25%)	0 (00%)	2 (05%)	2 (05%)	12 (29%)	15 (36%)	41 (100%)
Large Institution	15 (30%)	1 (02%)	0 (00%)	4 (08%)	4 (08%)	26 (52%)	50 (100%)

p = .0542



## RATING OF LESS THAN BACHELOR'S DEGREE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities	13 (33%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	1 (02%)	1 (02%)	25 (63%)	40 (100%)
4-Year Colleges	3 (19%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	4 (25%)	9 (56%)	16 (100%)
Community Colleges	9 (26%)	1 (03%)	2 (09%)	5 (14%)	1 (31%)	7 (20%)	35 (100%)

p = .0017

## RATING OF BACHELOR'S DEGREE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities	9 (23%)	3 (07%)	5 (13%)	1 (02%)	4 (10%)	18 (45%)	40 (100%)
4-Year Colleges	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	0 (00%)	4 (25%)	6 (39%)	16 (100%)
Community Colleges	6 (17%)	13 (37%)	11 (31%)	2 (06%)	1 (03%)	2 (06%)	35 (100%)

p = .0007

## RATING OF MASTER'S DEGREE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities	1 (02%)	30 (75%)	8 (20%)	1 (03%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	40 (100%)
4-Year Colleges	1 (06%)	7 (44%)	7 (44%)	0 (00%)	1 (06%)	0 (00%)	16 (100%)
Community Colleges	2 (06%)	11 (31%)	21 (30%)	1 (03%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	35 (100%)

p = .0200

## RATING OF DOCTORATE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities	7 (18%)	3 (07%)	28 (70%)	3 (05%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	40 (100%)
4-Year Colleges	3 (18%)	1 (06%)	10 (63%)	2 (12%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	16 (100%)
Community Colleges	10 (29%)	0 (00%)	6 (17%)	19 (54%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	35 (100%)

p = .0001

## RATING OF LESS THAN BACHELOR'S DEGREE BY REGION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
North Central	9 (38%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	4 (17%)	11 (46%)	24 (100%)
New England & Middle States	3 (25%)	0 (00%)	1 (09%)	0 (00%)	4 (33%)	4 (33%)	12 (100%)
Northwestern & Western	5 (21%)	1 (04%)	1 (04%)	6 (25%)	6 (25%)	5 (21%)	24 (100%)
Southern	8 (26%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	2 (06%)	21 (68%)	31 (100%)

p = .0017

## RATING OF BACHELOR'S DEGREE BY REGION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
North Central	6 (25%)	6 (25%)	4 (17%)	0 (00%)	1 (04%)	7 (29%)	24 (100%)
New England & Middle States	2 (17%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	0 (00%)	4 (33%)	1 (08%)	12 (100%)
Northwestern & Western	3 (13%)	5 (21%)	10 (42%)	3 (12%)	2 (08%)	1 (04%)	24 (100%)
Southern	6 (19%)	4 (13%)	2 (06%)	0 (00%)	2 (06%)	17 (55%)	31 (100%)

p = .0003

## RATING OF DOCTORATE BY REGION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
North Central	7 (29%)	0 (00%)	12 (50%)	5 (21%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	24 (100%)
New England & Middle States	4 (33%)	0 (00%)	5 (42%)	3 (25%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	12 (100%)
Northwestern & Western	6 (25%)	0 (00%)	6 (25%)	12 (50%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	24 (100%)
Southern	3 (10%)	4 (12%)	21 (68%)	3 (10%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	31 (100%)

$p = .0026$

## RATING OF PRINCIPLES OF TEACHING COURSE BY ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Deans	0 (00%)	6 (32%)	6 (32%)	7 (36%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	19 (100%)
Department Heads	6 (08%)	12 (17%)	42 (59%)	11 (15%)	1 (01%)	0 (00%)	72 (100%)

$p = .0576$

## RATING OF THESIS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities	6 (15%)	6 (15%)	19 (47%)	9 (23%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	40 (100%)
4-Year Colleges	2 (12%)	1 (06%)	6 (38%)	7 (44%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	16 (100%)
Community Colleges	3 (09%)	0 (00%)	5 (14%)	26 (74%)	1 (03%)	0 (00%)	35 (100%)

$p = .0017$

## RATING OF COURSE ON SPECIFIC TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Universities	14 (35%)	4 (09%)	11 (28%)	11 (28%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	40 (100%)
4-Year Colleges	2 (12%)	1 (06%)	6 (38%)	7 (44%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	16 (100%)
Community Colleges	2 (06%)	5 (14%)	17 (49%)	10 (28%)	1 (03%)	0 (00%)	35 (100%)

p = .0759

## RATING OF COURSE ON SPECIFIC TYPE OF INSTITUTION BY DEPARTMENT SIZE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
Under 5 Faculty	6 (15%)	9 (23%)	15 (38%)	10 (25%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	40 (100%)
5 Or More Faculty	12 (24%)	1 (02%)	19 (37%)	18 (35%)	1 (02%)	0 (00%)	51 (100%)

p = .0265

EMPLOYMENT QUALIFICATIONS FOR TEACHING FASHION MARKETING  
IN POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

by

DANA PATRICE RENDER

B.S., Kansas State University, 1974

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Clothing, Textiles and Interior Design

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1976

The study investigated employment qualifications for teaching fashion marketing preferred by administrators in various post-secondary institutions and compared those qualifications by certain characteristics of the administrators who preferred them. The instrument used was a mail questionnaire.

Of the 91 administrators whose responses were used in the study, 40 were from universities, 16 from four-year colleges, and 35 from community colleges. Twenty-five administrators represented business departments, 38 represented general home economics departments, and 28 represented various clothing arts departments.

The administrators' overall rankings of the major employment criteria in order of importance were: 1) work experience, 2) academic study, 3) previous academic employment, 4) academic degree, and 5) supporting coursework. The rankings of work experience and academic degree varied the most widely among the different types of administrators.

Fashion retailing was the type of work experience most often considered desirable by administrators with three to seven years of experience being preferred. An academic background of exclusively fashion marketing was less often desirable than a background of two related academic areas. The combination of fashion marketing plus clothing and textiles was preferred by the administrators. Teaching experience was more often considered desirable than research experience. Previous post-secondary teaching was the most desirable type of academic employment with three to seven years of experience being preferred. A master's degree had the highest percentage of "essential" responses. A doctorate had only a few "essential" responses, but had

a high percentage of "desirable" responses. In reference to supporting coursework, principles of teaching courses were preferred by administrators while the completion of a thesis concerned administrators the least. The administrators' ratings of qualifications varied by certain types of administrators.