DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 564 JC 910 245

AUTHOR Boughan, Karl
TITLE Graduate Employment: An Update Based on the 1989 Graduate Survey. Report RB91-9.
INSTITUTION Prince George's Community Coll., Largo, Md. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Graduates; Community Colleges; Employment; *Employment Patterns; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; Institutional Evaluation; *Job Training; *Outcomes of Education; Participant Satisfaction; Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Student Employment; Tables (Data); Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS Prince Georges Community College MD

ABSTRACT

In spring 1990, a survey was conducted of the 1989 graduates of Prince George's Community College's (PGCCs) occupational programs to assess graduates' success in obtaining full-time employment and their ratings of their preparation for employment. The 1990 survey marked the second consecutive year during which the college included indicators designed to measure employment status while attending PGCC as well as one year after graduation. A questionnaire was mailed to all 896 students receiving an associate degree or certificate during fiscal year 1989. Study findings, based on a 47% response rate, included the following: (1) 89% of the respondents were employed, with 76% working full time; (2) 76% indicated that they were "very" or "somewhat" satisfied with their current job; (3) the largest occupational category into which respondents fell (28%) was "new collar," a new level between middle white collar and clerk/technician, mainly comprised of health services and computer-related occupations; (4) 49% of all respondents traced some definite positive career change back to their PGCC course of study; (5) 91% were employed at some level while attending PGCC, with 51% employed full time; (6) 78% gave PGCC credit for contributing to a career boost, such as obtaining a current job, getting a raise or promotion, improving specific job skills, or preparing for a new career; (7) 52% of the respondents either increased their work hours or changed from one full-time position to another after graduation; and (8) women and minority graduates appeared to share fully in the levels of career advancement success enjoyed by recent graduates. The survey instrument is attached. (JMC)

GRADUATE EMPLOYMENT

An Update Based on the 1989 Graduate Survey

PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Karl Boughan

Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Report RB91-9

May 1991

PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

GRADUATE EMPLOYMENT - AN UPDATE BASED ON THE 1989 GRADUATE SURVEY

Research Brief RB91-9
May 1991

Introduction

For some time now, the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis has conducted twelve month follow-up mail surveys of P.G.C.C. graduates (A.A. and certificate receivers) sharing the same graduation fiscal year. The intention was to enable the College to track the initial post-attendance academic and occupational progress of its most formal "products." Outcome indicators focused on P.G.C.C. study program relevance for currently held jobs and transfer-school programs, and were kept relatively constant over the years to permit trend analysis. (See Graduate Employment, Research Brief RB89-3, for a report on the most recent survey in this series.)

Last year, however, we decided to depart somewhat from the traditional graduate survey questionnaire format. While keeping the program-relevance-based outcome indicators of the past, we created several new indicators designed to measure employment status during attendance as well as one year out from graduation so that post-graduation employment changes could be directly traced. Also, comprehensive codes for type of current position and employer were added so that a sense of our graduates' place within the structure of the present job market could be achieved. (A copy of the 1989 Graduate Survey Questionnaire is supplied in the Appendix.)

Methodology

During the fiscal year of 1989, P.G.C.C. awarded 896 A.A.s and certificates. Questionnaires for the 1989 Graduate Survey were mailed to all 896 in May 1990, with a re-mailing of 660 in June to prompt response and correct for address problems. Also, in mid-June, telephone interviewing of recalcitrants was begun. The objective of this multiple contact approach was to maximize response rate in order to minimize sample bias. Our target was a questionnaire return of 50 percent of the total mail universe. By the termination of data collection in July, we had managed to capture the responses of 440 graduates (49 percent), 427 (47 percent) of which were correct and complete, hence analyzable.

The last step in the set-up methodology called for sample bias testing. Mail surveys are notorious for producing biased samples since sample membership is self-selecting and unusually far from random in effect. However, if one is in a position to mail the entire universe, as we were, and achieves a response rate of around 50 percent or better, which we did, then the likelihood of serious bias becomes greatly reduced. After all, one would have to be exceedingly unlucky, after interviewing every other potential respondent, to come up with a pure oddball sample.

Nevertheless, we tested for possible sample bias by comparing the gender, age, race, grade point average and full-time/part-time student status characteristics of our sample with those all 1989 graduates, and found very close matches (plus or minus 2 percentage points). Our conclusion was that sample bias was minimum and that there was no real need for sample re-weighting.

Current Employment: Basic Findings

From a jobs-outcome perspective, the single most important question that can be asked is whether our 1989 graduates are currently employed. Table 1 below answers this question:

1-What is your current employment status?

	% Excl. No Ans.	% Excl. Out Mark	N
Employed Full-Time	76	81	(317)
Employed Part-Time	13	14	(56)
EMPLOYED	89	95	(373)
Unemp/Seeking Job	4	5	(18)
Not in Job Market	6	**	(27)
NOT EMPLOYED	11*	5	(45)
N/A	**	**	(9)
TOTAL	100	100	(427)

* rounding error
** assigned to missing

Almost nine out of ten (89 percent) respondents told us that they now hold down some kind of job -- 76 percent full-time situations, 13 percent part-time ones. Those not currently employed split 4 percent unemployed but looking for work, 6 percent not now seeking employment. This latter "out of job market" group consists mainly of full-time students (at other colleges), full-time homemakers and retired persons. When Out-of-Job-Market respondents are excluded from calculations on grounds of employment irrelevancy, the percentage of employed graduates jumps to 95 -- 81 percent with full-time jobs.

2-How satisfied are you with your current position?
[Employed Only]

	%	N
5-Very Satisfied	34	(126)
4-Somewhat Satisfied	42	(155)
3-Not Sure	10	(37)
2-Somewhat Dissatisfied	9	(34)
1-Very Dissatisfied	4	(15)
N/A	1	(4)
TOTAL	100	(373)

Granted the overwhelming majority of our A.A. and Certificate holders held jobs after graduation, but how happy are they with their present employment? The questionnaire included a five-point Job Satisfaction Scale to measure just this. As Table 2 (above) shows, job satisfaction runs reasonably high: Over three-quarters (76 percent) claim to be at least somewhat satisfied with their current work; adding the "Not Sure" category makes this 86 percent "not unhappy."

Part of explanation for this relative contentment may be post-graduate income levels. Table 3 reports volunteered current personal gross annual income (note: not family income). Almost nine in ten chose to respond, and those who did registered an average salary of near $ 25,000 (mean $ 24,673; median $ 25,000; mode $25,000-29,999). About 30 percent actually claimed to make more than $ 30,000 a year out from their PGCC graduation. The graduated student mean may be compared to the mean County individual gross annual income (1987) of $ 16,661. Thus, the average 1989 PGCC associate or certificate-holder by his or her own word makes roughly half again as much as the typical Prince Georgian.

3-What is your current personal gross annual income?

Salary Interval	%	N
$ 40,000 plus	6	(18)
$ 35,000 - 39,999	9	(28)
$ 30,000 - 34,999	16	(51)
$ 25,000 - 29,999	25	(80)
$ 18,000 - 24,999	22	(71)
$ 12,000 - 17,999	14	(44)
Less than $12,000	10	(33)
N/A	**	(48)
	102*	(373)
Mean	$ 24,673	(325)
Median	$ 25,000	(325)

* Rounding error
** Not included in percentaging

Thus, our former top students were almost all job-holders and mainly content in their work and reasonably well-paid, but what do they actually do for a living? For years now our graduate surveys have included an item asking employed respondents to write in name of their current position. This "open-ended" data, however, has gone unused due to the lack of an adequate coding scheme for rendering answers into analytically meaningful response categories. We have finally located one, a DOL-based job type coding scheme standard in the public opinion polling industry, and so for the first time we are able to give a precise report on type of graduate employment. Using a slightly modified version of this coding scheme, we found we could classify 99 percent of the write-ins. The coding scheme posits position categories arranged in rough social status order, according to prestige, usual monetary compensation, level of training required and scope of responsibilities.

The modification alluded to was the creation of a new category -- "New Collar" --between Middle White Collar and Clerk/Technician levels. "New Collar" has recently entered the occupational vocabulary to designate that aggregation of high-tech and semi-professional jobs, neither "white" nor "blue" in the traditional sense, created by the post-industrial and information revolutions -- e.g., computer programmer, x-ray technician, para-legal, and in these days of specialized training nurse.

The results can be found in Table 4 below:

4-Current Position by Occupational Code
[Employed Only]

FULL CODE			CONDENSED CODE		
	%	N		%	N
Professional	2	(7)	UPPER WH COL		(16)
Executive	2	(9)			
Mid Mgt/White Col	21	(77)	MID WHIT COL	21	(77)
New Col-Nurse	9	(32)	NEW COLLAR	28	(104)
New Col-Other Health	9	(33)			
N Col-Computer/Hi-Tech	4	(15)			
New Col-Misc	6	(24)			
Clerk/Technician	25	(94)	LOWER WH COL	25	(94)
Blue Col-Supervisor	5	(17)	UPPER BL COL	15	(56)
Blue Col-Highly Skilled	11	(39)			
Blue Col-Mid-Skilled	4	(13)	LOWER BL COL	6	(23)
Blue Col-Unskilled	3	(10)			
Unclassified	1	(3)	UNCLASSIFIED	1	(3)
TOTAL	100	(373)	TOTAL	100	(373)

The most interesting thing revealed in Table 4 is that the single largest occupational category our graduates fell into turned out to be "New Collar," the most rapidly expanding employment sector. Almost three in ten (28 percent) matched such a job description. Sixty-percent of these were employed in the health services area; the remainder held hi-tech, mainly computer-related positions (14 percent) or miscellaneous "New Collar" jobs such as para-legal (23 percent).

The second biggest category was "Clerk/Technician," a code mostly encompassing secretarial and other office-related work (25 percent). Middle White Collar (realtors, insurance salesmen, public school teachers, etc.) came next in employment importance (21 percent). As expected, unskilled labor and upper White Collar positions were the rarest categories of employment (6 and 4 percent, respectively).

We are also finally in a position to determine just what sorts of firms and organizations our graduates hold their positions in. Table 5 shows the results of coding the employer name data volunteered by respondents. (Note that response rate here was much lower (only 61 percent of employed graduates) compared with employment position response (87 percent); therefore, the statistics in Table 5 should be interpreted with some caution.)

The first column displays graduate employment by full Employer Code, and reveals the tremendous range of job situations taken up by our former students -- anything from banking through to manufacturing assembly line and all in between.

The second column, displaying the results in terms of a condensed code, is more useful for general interpretation.

From a broad economic sector perspective, about six out of ten 1989 winners of Associate of Arts degrees and occupational certificates (62 percent) tended to gain employment in the private sector (excluding education); another 7 percent took up jobs in various educational institutions and organizations (about 2 percent are currently employed by P.G.C.C. itself). The remainder -- 29 percent -- claims either the U.S. or state or local government as their employer. In particular, Federal employment among our graduates seems disproportionately high, compared with County employment as a whole:

	PGCC Graduates	County
Federal Civilian	17 %	7 %
U.S. Military	5 %	3 %
Total Fed. Empl.	22 %	10 %

COUNTY SOURCE: Statistical Reference: Prince George's County 1989 (NCPC, 1989) - 1990 Est.

The strongest employers of our degree winners, after government, are various health-related institutions as a group (17 percent) and the constantly growing hi-tech sub-sector (15 percent) -- both prime hirers of "New Collarites." Financial and Legal firms, together, absorb another 9 percent, while the entrepreneurial sub-sector (small business, miscellaneous independent consultants and other self-employeds) rounds out the top five employer types at 7 percent.

5-Current Position by Employer Code [Empl./Responding Only; N=229]

FULL CODE	%	CONDENSED CODE	%
Bank/Finance/Crd Union	4	FINANCIAL/LEGAL	9
Insurance Cos.	2		
CPA/Accounting Firms	1		
Legal Firm/Ind. Atty	3		
Physician/HBO/Hosp.	17	MEDICAL/HEALTH	17
Hi-Tech/Info Systems	7	TECHNOLOGICAL	15
Telecommunic./ATT,C&P	5		
Engin Firm/Consultnt	1		
Energy Co./Consultnt	1		
Trade Union/Prof Group	1	MISC PROF SERVICES	4
RealEst/Constructn Mgt	1		
Charity/Community Serv	2		
Misc Conslt/Self-Empl	2	SM BUS/SELF-EMPLOYD	7
Small Business	4		
Misc White Col Service	1		
Hotel/Motel	2	HOSPITALITY SERVICE	3
Restaurants	1		
Supermarkets	2	MANUF/WHLSAL/RETAIL	4
Dept Stores	1		
Lg Manufacturing Cos.	1		
Recreatn/Fitnss/Beauty	2	BLUE COL SERVICE	5
Auto Sales/Service	1		
Misc Blue Col Services	2		
Federal Civil Govt	17	U.S. GOVERNMENT	22
U.S. Milit/Intel.	5		
D.C. Government	2	STATE/LOCAL GOVT	7
MD State Govt	1		
PG Local Govt	3		
MD State Higher Ed	1	ED-ALL LEVELS	7
PGCC	2		
Other Higher Educ	2		
Pub Secondary/Elem.	1		
Pre-School/Daycare	1		
Unclassified	2	UNCLASSIFIED	2
TOTAL	101*		100

Lastly in this overview of current employment, let's answer the question of <u>where</u> graduates work. Table 6 below, based on coding volunteered employer address information, places employed respondents according to employer location. (Once again interpretive caution must be exercised due to low response rate; only 223 (60 percent) of our 373 currently employed respondents chose to supply this data.)

Table 6 shows that a little over two-fifths of P.G.C.C.'s recent graduates actually now work in the County (while another 13 percent hold jobs in neighboring Maryland Counties -- for a state majority of 54 percent). The District is the second most important jurisdictional site of graduate employment -- about a third (34 percent). Only 13 percent "cross the Bridge" into Virginia each morning or have left the region entirely to get work.

6-Current Position by Employer Location Code
[Employed/Responding Only]

SPECIFIC LOCATION	%	N	AREA	%	N
PG County	41	(91)	ALL MARYLAND	54	(120)
Other Maryland	13	(29)			
Washington, D.C.	34	(75)	OTHER REGIONAL	44	(99)
Virginia	11	(24)			
			TRI-STATE TOTAL	98	(219)
Out of Area	2	(4)			
TOTAL RESPONDING	100	(223)			

Whether one should consider a graduate In-County employment rate of 41 percent low or high is a good question. Lacking baseline data of the situation-at-peer-colleges sort, it is very difficult to say. On one hand, common sense seems to argue for pessimism -- only four of ten graduates find native work, plain and simple. On the other hand, P.G.C.C. perhaps should be given some allowance for being in a boarder county bumping up against a major city. Not only that, this particular urban neighbor is the center for national government and so many of our graduates go into federal and government-related work. (Unsurprisingly, almost three-quarters of our graduates who are currently GS workers commute to D.C.) In that light, the two-fifths figure may look more reasonable, even high.

P.G.C.C. Program Impact on Current Employment

How much of the employment success of P.G.C.C.'s recent graduates can actually be attributed to what was studied and learned while at the College?

One way on going about answering this central question is to pose this directly to the graduates. This is just what the graduate survey questionnaire did -- asking each currently employed respondent, in terms of a 5-point scale, how helpful his or her study here had been in four job-related ways: actually landing one's current job, qualifying for a salary raise or promotion in one's present work, improving specific work-related skills, and investigating or preparing for a change in job or career. Table 7 presents the results by full scales, "substantial" and "some help" classifications (points 4-5 and 3-5 jointly), and scale mean.

7-Program Impact Scales: To What Extent did Completing Program Help in ...
[Column Percentages; Employed Only]

Scale	A. Getting Current Job	B. Qual for Raise or Promotion	C. Improving Spec Job Skills	D. Preparing Future Career
5-A Great Deal	26	18	26	37
4	10	20	28	27
3-Fair Amount	16	23	25	17
2	6	9	9	7
1-Not at All	42	31	12	13
Substantial (4,5)	36	38	54	64
Some Help (3,4,5)	52	61	79	81
Scale Mean	2.72	2.86	3.48	3.67
# of Respondents	(347)	(339)	(345)	(340)

In the critical areas of actual employment procurement and advancement, P.G.C.C.'s role appears to be only moderately helpful. Program completion was of substantial importance in getting work to a little over a third (36 percent) of our employed recent graduates, and a bit under two-fifths (38 percent) told us that it was more than fairly useful in gaining a raise or promotion at work. In the perhaps less vital areas of improving job skills and

exploring career options, the results were much more striking: well over a majority of our employed respondents considered their time spent at the College very worth while (54 and 64 percent, respectively).

Since not every student will be hoping for the same job-related gain from P.G.C.C. program completion, it may be fair to summarize the data in Table 7 in a way which takes into account the multiple job aims of our respondents. Table 8 gives the distribution of respondents in terms of the number of times each gave a substantial help score (answered 4 or 5) across the four scales:

8-Overall Program Impact Scale:
Number of Substantial Job-Related Gains

Gain Number	%	N
4	16	(52)
3	18	(59)
2	23	(76)
1	21	(68)
None	22	(71)
Any Gain	78	(255)
# Resps.	--	(326)

Gain = Scale Points 4 or 5.

The results are very encouraging: almost four-fifths (78 percent) of all employed recent graduates responding claimed substantial benefit from P.G.C.C. study in at least one important career area, and over a third (34 percent) said that the College had been of real assistance in three or four!

Finally, two of the "Helpfulness" areas when considered jointly express the general idea of occupation status advancement. Respondents who answered affirmatively to the "Getting Present Job" or "Getting a Salary Raise or Promotion" items indicated any one of the following: due to completing my P.G.C.C. program, I either got my first job, got a new (presumably better) job, or experienced a material improvement in the quality of my current job. Table 9 gives an sense of how respondents rated program impact on overall career advancement:

9-Career Advancement Attributed to P.G.C.C. Program
[Substantial Scale Positive: Points = 4,5]

Program Very Helpful in ...	%	N
Raise/Promotion Only	15	(49)
Raise/Promotion & Getting Job	22	(74)
Getting Current Job Only	12	(39)
ALL PROGRAM-BASED CAREER ADVANCEMT	49	(162)
NEITHER	51	(170)
ALL EMPLOYEES RESPONDING	100	(332)

Thus, almost half (49 percent) of all graduates were able to trace some definite positive career change back to their P.G.C.C. study.

Another way to look at program job-impact is less directly in terms of program job-relevance. Do the classes and courses taken by employed graduates seem to them now as importantly related to the work they now perform?

10-Program and Current Job Relatedness
[Employed Only; N = 373]

Substantially Related	59 %
Not Substantially	41 %
	100 %

Three out of five (59 percent) say that the answer is "Yes," two of five (41 percent) say "No." But how is this to be interpreted? The concept of "program relevance" is tricky when the analytic objective is to get at quality of and responsibility for occupational outcomes. It is good that a fair majority found our programs relevant but this attributes no specific career-related virtue to P.G.C.C. study and comes close to a mere assertion that from an occupational perspective time was not wasted. On the other hand, the fact that 41 percent said "No," a not insignificant minority, should not necessarily be taken to spell a similar degree of College failure in occupational program planning and execution. Who is to "blame" for program non-relevance, after all? Not necessarily the College. Programs could be superb and on-target, yet students may mis-select given their career objectives or unanticipated future events.

Perhaps the best use for the program relevance variable is as a filter for clarifying the level and type of perceived program helpfulness. For example, as we have already noted, the proportion of employed graduates remarking on the prime importance of P.G.C.C. study for acquiring their current positions was not particularly inspiring -- 36 percent. But what if we took into account the logic of job training: training has no payoff if irrelevant to the job. Therefore, to gauge properly program career-impact one should look for evidence among the "relevantly trained."

11-Program Helpfulness by Program Job-Relevance
[Percent Giving Helpful=4,5 Responses]

Program Helpful in...	Program -Job-Rel.- Yes	No	All	N
Getting Current Job	56	8	36	(338)
Gaining Raise/Promotion	51	21	38	(331)
Improving Job Skills	73	30	55	(337)
Exploring Career Change	67	58	63	(332)
Overall Career Advancmt	67	25	49	(320)

With the exception of the career change aim (one less tied in to program specifics), the effect was a demonstrable improvement. For example, over half (56 percent) of employed graduates who had been in perceived-relevant programs confessed their time at P.G.C.C. crucial to getting their present positions (compared with only 8 percent in non-relevant programs), and exactly two-thirds of the program-relevant respondents (compared with a only a quarter of those with non-relevant programs) gave P.G.C.C. substantial credit for some specific career advancement.

Objective Indicators of Program Employment Impact

One final important approach to measuring program career-impact is through actually comparing pre- and post-graduation job statuses. Previously, this option was unavailable, but with this survey we introduced a pre-graduation job status questionnaire item paralleling the usual current status item. When these two are crossed, one can trace the objective pattern of job status shift with graduation as the fulcrum of change, as in Table 12 just below.

12-Job Status Shift from Pre-Graduation to Present
[Rounded Row Percentages except for Marginals]

	Current Job Status						
Pre-Grad Job Status	FT Empl	PT Empl	Unemp /Seek	Out of Mark		% ALL	N ALL
Full-Time Employed	93	4	1	2	:	51	(209)
Part-Time Employed	65	24	6	5	:	40	(162)
Unemp or Not Looking	30	22	14	35	:	9	(37)
% ALL	76	14	4	6		100	--
N ALL	(310)	(55)	(17)	(26)			(408)

According to Table 12, the great majority (91 percent) of our 1989 graduates were employed at some level while P.G.C.C. students -- 51 percent gainfully employed in full-time jobs. Only 8 percent took the classic stance of "student-not in job market." More important for our purpose here, the gross shift is revealed when we compare these pre-graduate figures with those for post-graduate job status. We find a increase in full-time employment of 25 percent (pre-51 to post-76 percent), a parallel fall in part-time employment of 26 percent (40 to 14) and little change in the non-employment categories (9 to 10 percent).

It is no surprise that the proportion of eventually-graduating students in the less-than-full-time employment column was large (49 percent); full-time employment leaves little time for college study, and what is surprising perhaps is that over half (51 percent) managed the stressful combination. (Ten percent of our respondents had been full-time in both respects!) But more to the point, we should not assume that those not working full-time as students were destined in the natural course of things to move up to full-time employment once they left P.G.C.C. and its rigors. Significant post-graduate unemployment was always possible, but turned out minimal. The gross 25 percent increase in the full-time job category post-graduation is a genuine accomplishment, especially during these economically depressed times, and at least in part creditable to the education available here.

Just as interesting as the gross job status shifts shown on Table 12 were the "micro-shifts" status category-by-category also displayed. Overwhelmingly, pre-graduating students with full-time jobs held onto this status after picking up degrees (93 percent) and only 3 percent ceased employment entirely. Almost two out of three pre-graduate part-time workers (65 percent) moved up to full-time status later while the status of a quarter (24 percent) remained constant; six percent sank into unemployment and one in twenty left the job market entirely. A little over half (52

percent) of the combined un- and non-employed group (at 6 respondents, unemployed numbers were to small for to be considered separately) managed to picked up some kind of job after getting degrees -- three in ten (30 percent) winning full-time positions; but, of course, almost half stayed un- or non-employed.

These complex patterns can be summarized in terms of employment-time increases or decreases, as in Table 13:

13-Summary of Post-Grad Employment Status Change in Terms of Weekly Employment-Time Shifts

EMPLOYMENT-TIME SHIFT	%	N	: SHIFT COMPONENT	% ALL	% TYPE	N
INCREASED HRS	30	(124)	: Up to FT	28	94	(116)
			: Up to PT	2	6	(8)
SAME HOURS	61	(250)	: FT -> FT	48	78	(194)
			: PT -> PT	10	16	(39)
			: <PT -> <PT	4	7	(17)
DECREASED HRS	5	(20)	: Down to PT	2	40	(8)
			: Down to Unemp	3	60	(12)
LEFT JOB MARKET	3	(14)	: Left Market	3	100	(14)
ALL	99*	(408)	: ALL	100	--	(408)

Thus, 30 percent of our respondents experienced upwards work mobility after graduation (94 percent of them up to full-time jobs), about three-fifths (61 percent) made no headway in hours working (or not working), and only 8 percent lost occupational ground (over 40 percent of these "voluntarily" -- those exiting the job market all together).

Table 14 below takes this shift analysis one step further. First, it takes into account a peculiarity of the job shift measure -- upwards "inelasticity" for an important class of respondent: by definition, since the cap of the scale is full-time work, those who were already full-time workers prior to graduation therefore cannot shift any higher. This has the effect of biasing downwards the estimate of the increased hours shift. To get a truer picture of job shift, only respondents with the potential for change should be counted. The second column of Table 14 shows shift results with "immovables" removed from consideration, and tells us that for just those who had room above them for upward job mobility, over six in ten (62 percent) actually experienced it.

14-Employment-Time Shift controlling for Change Inelasticity and Perceived Program Helpfulness

Pre-/Post-Grad Employment-Time	% All	N	% Mobiles Only*	N
Increased Hours	30	(124)	62	(124)
Same Hours	61	(250)	28	(56)
Decreased Hours	5	(20)	5	(10)
Left Job Market	3	(14)	5	(9)
All	99	(408)	100	(199)
Prog. Helpful Getting Job:				
- All Employed Resps.	36	(338)	--	--
- % of Incr. Hrs. Only	57	(118)	--	--
- And % of Prog-Rel Only	75	(83)	--	--

* Excludes Pre-Graduate Full-Time Job-Holders who by definition could not shift upwards

Second, Table 14 gives the proportion of respondents who experienced job upward mobility and attributed it largely to their completion of P.G.C.C. programs. Compared with all currently employed respondents, the post-graduate upwardly job mobile were more than half again as likely to say that completing their degrees were very helpful (points 4,5) in getting them their jobs (36 and 57 percent, respectively). And when only upwardly mobiles with perceived job-relevant degrees were counted, the rate more than doubled. A full three-quarters traced their present employment to P.G.C.C. study.

Table 15 above expands upon the notion of post-graduate work shift, to include not only change in terms of work hour level but also of reported change in "position" or "job title." Work level shifting, if upwards, usually means getting a new and better job but not necessarily a different sort of job (e.g., from part-time computer programmer to full-time computer programmer). Another way to experience "career advancement" is to get a new and better position (more interesting tasks, pay, prestige, power) while remaining within the same work hour level (e.g., from full-time computer programmer to full-time systems analyst).

15-Overall Post-Graduate Employment Change
by Program Helpfulness to Career Advancement
[Percentages Rounded]

Post-Graduate Employment Change** [Column Percents]	% All	Prog Very Helpful in Job Advancement* [Row Percentages] % Yes	% No	N
New Level/New Pos.	20	73	28	(69)
New Level/Same Pos.	11	63	37	(38)
Same Level/New Pos.	22	45	55	(76)
[ANY WORK ADVANCE]	[52]	59	41	(183)
Emp/No Work Advance	36	31	69	(132)
Unempl/Out of Market	11	--	--	(17)
All	100 (394)	49	51	(332)

* See Table 11 for definition
** Either work hours shift or job position shift; 33 missing due to non-response on position

The questionnaire, in another innovation, requested that working respondents supply us with the date they took on their present "positions," and from this data it was an easy matter to post-graduate "position-changers." (One great advantage of measuring position- as opposed to work level-shift is that there is no logical cap such as full-time employment level. Thus it gives the added benefit of enabling us to detect post-graduate job gains even among the pre-graduate full-timer workers, which as Table 13 showed make up almost half our sample.)

The two -- landing a job or increasing hours worked and upgrading position held -- when combined cover most of what is usually meant by "getting ahead" on the job, and the distribution of respondents by this general career advancement indicator (and respondent attribution of advancement to P.G.C.C. program completion) is what is portrayed on Table 15.

What we see find is that over half (52 percent) of our respondents experience some sort of positive job shift within one year of P.G.C.C. program completion, a far better estimate than the 30 percent obtained through measuring post-graduate work hours increase alone. And one in five (20 percent) actually "got ahead" both ways -- new job level and new position. Also, we see a definite inclination to attribute post-graduate career advancement

to program completion; almost three-fifths (59 percent) experiencing some post-P.G.C.C. job gain gave serious credit to the College (which increases to 78 percent (!) for career advancers who thought they had gone through a job-related program).

But what about the remaining 48 percent of our graduates who experienced no discernable career advancement? Is this "half empty" finding a sign of College failure in some sense? Not necessarily.

Combining Objective and Subjective Indicators

We should also remind ourselves that not all students set out to win career gains through P.G.C.C. study; neither do all the job-interested take the appropriate program track (let alone study hard or well) while here, nor do they all make the most employment-advancing moves after graduation. Furthermore, improving specific job skills and exploring career options were not apart of this study's "career advancement" definition because neither relates to immediate "get ahead" gains, although conceptually both are part of a larger notion of "career enhancement" and may very well lead to future hard career advancement. As we already noted, almost 80 percent of our graduates told us that completing their P.G.C.C. programs led directly to at least one career gain according to their placement on a perceived gain scale that included skill upgrading and option exploration.

On the other hand, how reliable a gauge of College success is the "half full" rate of career advancement? After all, College training is not the only reason people get hired or promoted -- other qualifications, personality, drive, connections and plain luck all play their parts. Just what is the proportion, anyway, of former students who got new jobs, positions, promotions or raises they themselves credit to P.G.C.C. -- or, as one might say, the "program-dependent" career advancement rate?

All of these and related questions are dealt with in Table 16. Here respondents are grouped according to "objective" and "subjective" career advancement criteria in combination, and then the percentage of all students "getting ahead" after graduation is displayed for the whole sample, and by selected program and intention sub-groups -- Reason for Attending (Career Entry/Any Other Reason), Award Program (Occupation A.A. or Certificate/Transfer A.A.) and Post-Graduate Transfer Activity (No Transfer/Transfer to Study Full-Time).

The whole sample post-graduate advancement estimate appears to run from a low of 27 percent (only those objective advances subjectively credited to PGCC) to a high of 63 percent (advances of whatever sort, including objective advances not perceived due to program completion) depending on how measured.

16-Post-Graduate Career Outcome Groups
by Selected Program-Related Categories

ALL-STUDENT & POST-GRADUATE CAREER ADVANCEMENT:	PROGRAM-RELATED CATEGORIES						
	All Resp	Attend Reason		PGCC Program		PostGrad Transfer	
		Job	Oth	Occ	Trns	NoTrs	FT
BOTH OBJECTIVE* & SUBJECTIVE**	27	42	23	33	14	32	16
SUBJECTIVE ONLY	39	51	35	47	22	45	23
OBJECTIVE ONLY	51	69	46	55	44	55	43
EITHER OBJECTIVE OR SUBJECTIVE	63	79	59	69	52	67	51

* OBJECTIVE Advancement = Increased Work Hours Level and/or Better Position at Same WH Level measured by pre-/post-graduate employment status data

** SUBJECTIVE Advancement = Employed Respondent's report of first job, better job, promotion within job or salary raise believed to be substantial due to completion of PGCC Program

Perhaps the fairest of these estimates is the "Subjective Only" one which eliminates advances not traceable to PGCC impact but maintains both the idea of career advancement as "job acquisition" (over two-thirds of the subjective advancers were also objective advancers) and "job betterment" of the promotion or salary raise variety. In this case, we could say that <u>within one year of graduation, about four out of ten PGCC graduates experience some sort of significant career enhancement which they would not have achieved without study at the College</u>.

Furthermore, it appears that students can significantly increase their chances for post-graduate career advancement by starting out with job-obtainment as a goal (51 percent advance compared to only 35 percent among non-career entry-oriented students -- a .46 increase in probability), by enrolling in an occupational degree program (47 to 22 percent for academic students -- probability up 1.14) and by going straight to the job market after graduation rather than continuing study at a transfer school (45 to 23 percent -- probability increase .95). Under the more relaxed standard of "any kind of detectable post-graduate career advancement -- objective or subjective," students with career entry goals achieved a truly astonishing rate of success -- four out of five (79 percent) "got ahead" within a year of graduation!

The last table in this series (17 below) shows the career advancing impact of specific curricula (actual program categories are based on a condensation of the HEGIS code). No matter which gauge of advancement is employed, the pattern is clear and unaltered: Nursing graduates, those formerly in other Allied Health studies and degree-holders in the "miscellaneous" program categories always appear to perform best when it comes to career advancement, General Studies and other non-business transfer programs always produce the poorest career advancement results, and all other program categories fall somewhere in the middle. Let's examine the two extremes.

17-Post Graduate Career Advancement by Specific Program Curricula*

Program	Obj & Subj	Subj Only	Obj Only	Either	N
Gen. Studies	10	16	42	48	(82)
A&S/Engin/Comp	20	25	40	5	(20)
Bus. Admin.	20	34	51	66	(35)
Mgt/Acc't/Market	15	32	46	63	(106)
Computer Techs	28	39	47	58	(36)
Engineer Techs	40	67	47	73	(15)
Nursing	69	74	86	91	(35)
Allied Health	53	71	82	100	(17)
Crim Just/Para	28	40	43	55	(47)
Misc Occup**	67	81	71	86	(21)
All Graduates	27	39	51	64	(414)

* Rounded Percentage Advancing of All in Program Category
** Includes Office Technologies, Hospitality Services, Early Childhood Education and Early Childhood Management

Nursing is a good example of our top performing programs. It is highly structured according to well-worked out professional requirements, leads directly to professional accreditation (in this case through examination), feeds an exploding segment of the job market, and is by and large enrolled in by highly motivated students definitely seeking career entry.

But something else may be involved here as well -- gender. All of the most career enhancing programs have a predominantly female enrollment and prepare for jobs traditionally assigned to females by social convention. ("Miscellaneous" is no exception, being an aggregate of Office Technology, Early Childhood Education

and Daycare Management, and Hospitality Services.) It would seem that PGCC does a truly excellent job helping women into the job market -- if they are aiming for traditional employment assignments.

At the bottom of the career advancement ladder are the General Studies students -- but perhaps not forever, because the great majority (72 percent) of them have opted, as was the design of the program, for continuing their education at a transfer college which may pay big occupational dividends down the road. This in large part explains the General Studies program's poor career showing; our measures are "one year out" indicators which most enrollees here have deliberately postponed any real career push for at least another year or two.

On the other, those formerly in General Studies who failed or chose not to transfer <u>also</u> tend to fall into the no-career-advancement category, in fact at an even greater rate than do the transferees. For example, whereas 81 percent of the transferees did not "get ahead" according to the "Subjective Advancement" measure, the figure was 91 percent for non-transferees; not only that, 28 percent are actually not currently employed in any job!

<u>Other Correlates of Current Graduate Employment</u>

In this section, we will take up the question of the impact of academic behavior (apart from program choice and participation) and demography upon current graduate employment and career advancement. Table 18 below gives full-time job-holding and subjective career advancement percentages by three key academic variables (reported P.G.C.C. full-time/part-time study, cumulative grade point average in grade interval terms, and span of attendance between initial and final terms) and by four important demographic variables (gender, age at graduation, race, and living arrangements during P.G.C.C. attendance).

Its one special analytic feature is the elimination of full-time transfer students from consideration. This was done to control for the interfering effects of full-time study at a transfer college. Full-time transfer strongly correlates both with current employment (negatively) and with several of the demographic items (variously). For example, younger graduates are far more likely to be full-time transfers than older graduates; and the former are also more prone to less than full-time employment. Therefore, without statistical controls, it would be impossible to determine whether the YOUTH x NON-FT JOB connection is truly an age phenomenon or is simply the hidden result of high youth transference. Therefore, only percentages for non-transfers and part-timers will be reported here to allow a clear reading.

18-Current Full-Time Job-Holding and Subjective Career Advancement by Selected Academic & Demographic Factors [Rounded Percentages/Full-Time Transfers Excluded]

Academic	FT Job	Job Adv
FT Study Mostly	82	57
Mix of Both	87	40
PT Study Mostly	88	38
B+/A: 3.50+	84	35
B: 3.00-3.49	87	46
C+: 2.50-2.99	90	43
C: 2.00-2.49	84	49
< 3 Yrs Study Span	81	54
3-4 Yrs Study Span	85	48
5-9 Yrs Study Span	92	47
10+ Yrs Study Span	86	29
TOTAL (N=323)	87	42

Demographic	FT Job	Job Adv
Age 18-24	87	52
Age 25-39	87	43
Age 40 +	84	29
Male	89	44
Female	85	42
White	86	44
Non-White	87	41
Spouse/No Kids	86	45
Spouse & Kids	90	30
Single Parent	83	25
Liv with Parent	87	40
UnMar Coupl/Grp	96	60
Isolate	84	25

The first finding from Table 18 is a general one -- academic and demographic factors, on the whole, seem to explain surprisingly little when it comes to P.G.C.C. graduate employment. Their impact is especially weak in affecting the probability of graduate full-time job holding; no very meaningful variation occurs -- only minor fluctuations about the all-non-transfer mean is seen.

The power of academic and demographic variables picks up a bit when it comes to explaining variations in career advancement. On the academic side, for example, there appears to be a fair tendency for full-time P.G.C.C. program participation to enhance probabilities of moving up on the job -- Full-timers 57 percent to Part-Timers 38 percent. Also, swift passage through one's program also appears relatively helpful -- those completing within 3 years 54 percent to those taking 10 years or more 29 percent.

On the demographic side, younger graduates seem more advancement prone than older ones (52 percent for 18-24 year-olds vs. 29 percent for the over-40s) and the effect of student living arrangements interestingly come to the fore: for some reason, an advantageous prelude to career advancement turned out to be having been part of an unmarried couple or familially un-related group home (60 percent advancement), especially when contrasted to having lived solitarily or as a single parent while a student (both 25 percent advancement).

Still, it astonishes us how minimal a difference grades, gender and race make. But maybe there is some good news here. While of course it is disconcerting to view so little connection between course performance and career performance (if anything the relationship is somewhat negative), it is genuinely cheering to observe graduate men with only a 2 point advantage over graduate women, and white graduates with only a three point advantage over minority graduates. Perhaps completing a P.G.C.C. program really does help narrow the social gaps in employability and career status.

Graduate Employment "Quality"

But what about the quality of the new jobs landed by our graduates? Do they advance to more prestigious assignments? And how is the money? And do the different demographic groups pace each other in their ladder climbing? These questions are the burden of this final section.

Table 19 below displays the distribution of our recent fully-employed graduates -- all together and by advancing and non-advancing sub-groups -- according to three employment "quality" indicators: job position type ordered in terms of conventional notions of prestige from highest to lowest, a summary position prestige scale base on position type (6=high, 1=low), and reported salary (gross personal income for last year).

19-Graduate Job Quality by Subjective Career Advancement
[Full-Time Employed Only]

Job Quality Indicators		All	----Subj. Adv.---- Yes	No
Position Type (Scale Point)				
Executive/Top Profs	(6)	5	6	4
Middle Mgt/Lesser Profs	(5)	21	17	24
"New Collar"	(4)	31	40	22
Clerical/Technical	(3)	24	18	29
Skilled Blue Collar	(2)	16	16	15
Unskilled Blue Collar	(1)	4	2	6
Prestige Scale Score*		3.61	3.71	3.53
Personal Income		$26,500	$25,800	$27,000

* Weighted Average of respondent proportions in status categories by corresponding scale values

As a group, our recent fully-employed graduates register a job prestige score (3.61) of slightly above the theoretical middle (3.50) of the employment status ladder, in itself a healthy sign. More to the point, Career Advancers do in fact score a bit higher on job prestige than Non-Advancers -- by a very modest .18, around a fifth of a status step.

It is unfortunate that we lack the data on pre-graduation job position which would allow us directly to measure movement towards greater employment prestige over time. But at least this indirect approach produces job prestige scores in the right "direction" comparing advancers vs. non-advances and results in a step-difference of sufficient magnitude to suggest a real link not only between P.G.C.C. program completion and employment "quantity" but also with employment "quality." Simply put, "Advancers" tend to hold more highly regarded jobs than do "non-advancers," and by definition since advancers have advanced to new positions the gain must be in higher quality work.

The position type data indicate that the advancer higher score is due mainly to the very high proportion (40 percent) of up-and-coming "New Collar" jobs they manage to land. Non-advancers, on the other hand, boast "New Collar" assignments at only around half that rate (22 percent), and while they do slightly better than Advancers in the White Collar categories (28 to 23, respectively), they also tend to load significantly more in the clerical and blue collar categories (50 percent compared with the Advancers' 36 percent).

A paradox, however, crops up when we examine the salary data -- Non-Advancers, notwithstanding their lower-grade employment, tend to bring home more money than do higher status Advancers. The difference is small, less than $1,200 (or 6 percent), but it exists and runs directly contrary to the prestige finding. The paradox's solution lies in understanding the role of life-cycle. The Advancers, as a group, tend to be considerably younger and their "career advancement" in a majority of instances is of the "first job" sort. Entry level assignments, even those inaugurating careers in prestigious fields, are normally low-paying. It is more usual than not that a beginning nurse makes considerably less than a secretary with years of seniority.

The last table in this study returns to the question of P.G.C.C.'s role in achieving employment equity for special populations.

20-Special Populations: Job Prestige Scores and Mean Salary by Subjective Career Advancement [Full-Time Employed Only]

	-----All-----		: -Subj. Adv.--		---No Adv.---	
	Status	Salary	: Status	Salary	Status	Salary
Female	3.74	$26,000	: 3.85	$25,300	3.64	$26,600
Male	3.30	$27,600	: 3.43	$26,700	3.17	$28,300
Abs. Dif.*	.44	- 1,600	: .42	- 1,400	.47	- 1,700
Rel. Dif.**	113	94	: 112	95	115	94
Non-White	3.64	$27,200	: 3.75	$26,800	3.56	$27,600
White	3.58	$26,000	: 3.70	$25,000	3.48	$26,800
Abs. Dif.*	.06	1,200	: .05	1,800	.06	800
Rel. Dif.**	102	105	: 101	107	102	103

* (Female - Male), (Non-White - White)
** 100 x (Female / Male), 100 x (Non-White / White)

Let's look at the basic all-employed pattern first (figure columns one and two). The most striking finding is that recent fully-employed graduates as a group show a good deal of employment equity. Female/Male and Minority/White salary differences turn out to be fairly small (about 5 percent) and in terms of relative prestige of position, both "disadvantaged" sub-groups actually tend to do somewhat better than their privileged counterparts.

The pattern is not entirely rosy, however. In particular, given the substantial job prestige edge (13 percent) women graduates enjoy over men graduates, it is difficult to explain even the small reverse income differential (- 6 percent) separating them from the males. Although it is true that a near majority of our women graduates are mostly beginning Allied Health workers, the "career entry" explanation does not seems wholely convincing considering the degree of contrast between prestige and income levels. Is it possible that here we see evidence of a discriminatory gender gap in the job marketplace?

Examining the gender distributions by specific job headings, which through weighted averaging produced the prestige scores in the first place, we find:

	Women	Men
White Collar (Pts. 5,6)	26 %	23 %
"New Collar" (Pt. 4)	32 %	27 %
Clerical/Technical (Pt. 3)	31 %	9 %
Blue Collar (Pts. 1,2)	11 %	41 %

Thus, apart from a slight female advantage in the White and New Collar categories, the main difference in distributions proves to be the strong disproportionate concentration of women in the clerical order, while men seem very disproportionately to fall into the Blue Collar classification. And since the former ranks over the latter in the occupational prestige scale, the female scale score gains the crucial boost. Why then the reverse mean salary difference? The income pattern by prestige stratum is as follows:

	Women	Men
White Collar (Pts. 5,6)	$28,600	$31,000
"New Collar" (Pt. 4)	$28,800	$26,900
Clerical/Technical (Pt. 3)	$22,800	$17,400
Blue Collar (Pts. 1,2)	$21,600	$28,500

What is happening under the surface, then, is that our women graduates on average earn less at the White Collar level (-$2,400, relative difference 8 percent), more than hold their own in the middle occupational strata , but then fall drastically behind men in pay at the Blue Collar level (- $6,900, relative difference 24 percent!).

In fact male Blue Collar pay almost equals that of female New Collar remuneration. This latter fact is the single biggest contributor to masculine "overpay." We should hasten to state that this may not be simply an anomaly of this particular data set but a reflection of a well-documented larger economic phenomenon -- the "blue chip" Blue Collar worker: mostly males, highly skilled in specialized manual work, with long-term seniority and highly paid jobs in high tech industries. Apparently our Blue Collar male graduates belong mainly to this group.

When the two main racial groups among our fully-employed graduates are contrasted, the more normal positive correlation between occupational prestige and job remuneration appears. The surprise here is that minority graduates (94 percent black) for a change have the advantage, though slight, over their white cohorts -- relative prestige difference 102, salary difference 105. This makes sense in terms of actual occupational distributions:

	Minor.	White
White Collar (Pts. 5,6)	22 %	27 %
"New Collar" (Pt. 4)	36 %	27 %
Clerical/Technical (Pt. 3)	28 %	22 %
Blue Collar (Pts. 1,2)	15 %	23 %

Aside from a bit of an edge in the White Collar category, Whites fall far short of non-whites in holding down New Collar jobs and register a Blue Collar employment rate more than half again higher than non-whites. Furthermore, minority income advantage is pretty much maintained across each occupational level. Since, this pattern is the opposite of that which obtains in the larger

society, it may imply two things, not mutually exclusive: 1) A complete P.G.C.C. education truly acts as a springboard to minority success, and 2) those mostly black minority students who manage to stick it out through to graduation demonstrate an exceptional drive which also pays big occupational dividends once they enter the job market.

The remainder of Table 20 shows the scores on these same prestige and income indicators but this time for two sub-samples -- Subjective Career Advancers and Non-Advancers. The pattern is very clear: Career Advancers of whatever gender or racial background always do better in terms of occupational status and remuneration compared to parallel Non-Advancers; but also prestige and pay differences between men and women and between whites and non-whites, whether Advancers or Non-Advancers, do not vary significantly from those exhibited by the whole fully employed sample. From the standpoint of occupational equity this is a very good sign. But just why this is so will take a little explaining.

We have already established that those who after graduation "subjectively career-advanced" (told us that they got new work or ahead on the job mainly due to completing their P.G.C.C. programs) were also more likely than non-advancers to occupy prestige positions or make above-average wages. In other words, graduation led to work, and not just any work but to "quality" work with the benefits of prestige and good pay. But it was always possible, at least theoretically, that the lion's share of career advancement benefits went to males and whites, that women and minority graduates who "advanced" got only the "left over" jobs. Table 20 shows that this just isn't the case. The two less privilege groups share with rough equality in the benefits of advancement with the two more socially promoted groups.

Conclusion

With the addition of new indicators for probing more deeply into the type, quantity and quality of graduate employment and new techniques for gauging post-graduation change in employment status and P.G.C.C.'s specific share in the credit for measured career advancement, we have been able for the first time paint something like a comprehensive portrait of our former students' current working life and the College role in forming it:

* Despite the current economic recession and the pursuit of baccalaureates and other further educational programs by two out of five former students, almost nine in ten 1989 P.G.C.C. graduates now hold jobs and over 75 percent are fully employed.

* Working graduates registered high levels of job satisfaction (76 percent at least "somewhat satisfied"), made reasonably good money ($25,000 mean personal gross annual salary), and tended to pull down positions in the upper middle echelons of the occupational prestige ladder (74 percent lower-to-middle white collar by standard DOL-based code).

* Particularly noteworthy is the proportion of graduates opting for "New Collar" careers (28 percent) -- technical jobs requiring intensive training (e.g., Nursing, Computer Programming, Para-Legal). This is very appropriate since the "New Collar" segment is the fastest growing in the nation's job market and "New Collar" training is a major thrust of the College's occupational division.

* Furthermore, almost four graduates in five (78 percent) give P.G.C.C. credit for providing their careers with at least one of the following boosts -- getting their current job, getting a raise or promotion, improving specific job skills or preparing for a new career.

* Exactly half, in fact, tell us that the College was responsible for either their having a job after graduation or their making more money or moving up to a better position -- the two most important elements in the concept of Career Advancement.

* Our graduates' subjective sense of career advancement was also paralleled by objective post-graduation career movement: Over half (52 percent) actually either increased their work hours (almost always a move into full-time employment) or changed from one full-time position to a better one. And just about two-thirds of these "objective career advancers" credit P.G.C.C. with the improvement.

* Finally, women and minority graduates appear to share fully in the levels of career advancement success -- both subjective and objective -- enjoyed by our recent graduates; no real difference in success rates among gender and racial groups could be detected.

Thus, The major findings of this study were on the whole quite encouraging.

Karl Boughan

Research and Planning Analyst

CLASS OF 1989 GRADUATE SURVEY

PRINCE GEORGE'S
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Specific directions are given for completing some of the questions in this questionnaire. Where no directions are given, please circle the number of the most appropriate response. Continue to the next question unless specific directions are given to go elsewhere. This form should take less than ten minutes to complete, and all answers will be strictly confidential. Thank you.

PART I - EMPLOYMENT

A. What is your current employment status:

1. Employed full-time (30 or more hours per week)
2. Employed part-time
3. Unemployed and seeking a job - **GO TO PART II**
4. Unemployed and not seeking a job/homemaker - **GO TO PART II**

B. Is your job substantially related to the program you completed at PGCC?

1. Yes
2. No

C. To what extent did completing your PGCC program help you:

	A Great Deal		A Fair Amount		Not At All
Obtain your current job	5	4	3	2	1
Qualify for a promotion/raise	5	4	3	2	1
Improve specific job skills	5	4	3	2	1
Prepare you for a future career change	5	4	3	2	1
Gain the confidence and skills useful in any job	5	4	3	2	1

D. What is the title of your current position?

_____

E. When did you start working in this *position*?

month_____year_____

F. How satisfied are you with your current position?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Sure	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
5	4	3	2	1

G. What is your employer's name and address?

_____

_____

_____

NOTE: The college sometimes contacts employers for further evaluation of its programs. If you would prefer that we NOT contact your employer, check here: ☐

H. When did you start working for this employer?

month_____ year_____

I. What is your current *gross annual* salary (before overtime, deductions, and taxes)? All responses are confidential.

$_____

PART II - CONTINUING EDUCATION

J. Have you taken courses at another college since graduating from PGCC?

1. Yes, full-time (12 or more hours per term)
2. Yes, part-time
3. No - **GO TO PART III**

K. Was your program of study related to your PGCC major?

1. Yes
2. No

L. What is the name and location of the school you have most recently attended?

1. University of Maryland, College Park
2. University of Maryland, University College
3. Other (please specify):_____

M. How well did PGCC prepare you for your studies at the above school?

Very Well	Well	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

N. Do you intend to earn a degree at the above named school?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Undecided

PART III- GENERAL

O. Would you recommend PGCC to a person seeking to complete the same program that you studied here?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

P. Would you have attended PGCC if your specific program had not been available?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

Q. What is the highest level of education that your parents attained in school?

	Mother	Father
Less than high school degree	____	____
High school degree	____	____
Some college	____	____
AA (two-year) degree	____	____
BA (four-year) degree	____	____
Master's degree	____	____
Professional degree (e.g. law)	____	____
Doctorate	____	____

R. How was your college education paid for? (please circle all that apply)

1. Self
2. Parent/guardian
3. Employers
4. Spouse
5. Financial Aid (grant or scholarship)
6. Work study
7. Student loan
8. Other, please specify_____

S. To what extent did your attendance at PGCC help you accomplish the following? (For each item, circle the number that most closely reflects your opinion)

	A Great Deal		A Fair Amount		Not At All
1. Improve your writing	5	4	3	2	1
2. Expand or enhance your appreciation of art, music, or literature	5	4	3	2	1
3. Increase your ability to use mathematics	5	4	3	2	1
4. Improve your understanding of science and technology	5	4	3	2	1
5. Increase your attentiveness to news and world events	5	4	3	2	1
6. Improve your understanding of the logic and merits of arguments	5	4	3	2	1
7. Clarify your educational or career goals	5	4	3	2	1
8. Enhance your self-confidence	5	4	3	2	1
9. Improve your reading comprehension	5	4	3	2	1
10. Increase your knowledge of history and other cultures	5	4	3	2	1
11. Increase your enjoyment of learning	5	4	3	2	1

PART IV - BACKGROUND

For the following questions please give the response which most closely describes your situation *during the time you attended PGCC*. If more than one response fits due to changes you may have made while attending the college, please choose the one response which is *most* appropriate.

T. Did you primarily attend PGCC during the day or evening?

1. Day
2. Evening
3. Day and evening about equally

U. Did you primarily attend full-time or part-time?

1. Full-time
2. Part-time
3. Full-time and Part-time about equally

V. How many times did you change your mind about the field in which you wanted your degree from PGCC? _____

W. Which statement most closely describes your living arrangement while you were attending PGCC?

1. Lived with non-family housemates
2. Lived with one parent or guardian
3. Lived with children (single head of household)
4. Lived with spouse (with or without children)
5. Lived with both parents
6. Lived alone
7. Other, please describe _____

X. How many persons were living in your household at that time (please include yourself)? _____

Y. If you had the responsibility of raising children while you attended PGCC, how did that responsibility affect your school work?

1. I was not responsible for any children while attending PGCC.
2. The responsibility of children did not affect my school work.
3. The responsibility of children took some time from my school work.
4. The responsibility of children took a lot of time from my school work.

Z. What was the approximate total income of the household in which you resided? (circle one)

1. Below $6,000
2. $6,000 - $11,999
3. $12,000 - $17,999
4. $18,000 - $23,999
5. $24,000 - $29,999
6. $30,000 - $35,999
7. $36,000 - $41,999
8. $42,000 - $47,999
9. $48,000 - $53,999
10. $54,000 - $59,999
11. Over $60,000

AA. Please indicate which of the following most closely describes your employment situation during the time you attended PGCC:

1. Employed full-time (35 + hours a week)
2. Employed between 20 and 35 hours a week
3. Employed between 10 and 20 hours a week
4. Employed less than 10 hours a week
5. Unemployed, seeking employment
6. Unemployed, not seeking employment/homemaker

AB. If you were employed while you attended PGCC, how did it affect your school work?

1. I was not employed.
2. My job did not interfere with my school work.
3. My job took some time from my school work.
4. My job took a lot of time from my school work.

AC. What was the highest level of education you had attained *before attending* PGCC?

1. Less than high school degree
2. High school degree
3. Some college
4. AA (two-year) degree
5. BA (four-year) degree
6. Master's degree
7. Professional degree (e.g. law)
8. Doctorate

AD. During the time between the first semester you attended PGCC and the last semester you attended PGCC, did you attend any other college?

1. No, I did not attend any other college.
2. Yes, during one or more semesters I attended another college at the same time that I was enrolled in courses at PGCC.
3. Yes, during one or more semesters I attended another college and was not enrolled in courses at PGCC.
4. Both 2 and 3.

AE. In what way could your education at PGCC have been improved?

_____

_____

_____

_____

AF. What did you like best about PGCC?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return this completed questionnaire in the prepaid return envelope provided, or mail to the Office of Institutional Research, Prince George's Community College, Largo, MD 20772. Thank you for your assistance!

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges

JUN 21 1991

37

Please make corrections if necessary

Name

Address

38