ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This survey was begun as a class project in Information Systems 333 - Sample Survey, during the Winter semester, 1984. Class members under the direction of Dr. John Stedl designed the questionaire, drew the random sample, and telephoned those in the sample. The members were: Tyrone Beardon, Vernon Black, Gwendolyn Brown-Williams, Yvonne Christman, Jackie Graves, Veronica Harvey, Shirley Hudson, Karen Kozlowski, Shelia Shaw, and William Walls.

During the Spring semester, 1984 Yvonne Christman and Karen Kozlowski continued to work on the analyses of the resulting data. Ms. Kozlowski entered the data into a computer data base and ran statistical programs. Ms. Christman worked on the first drafts of this report.

They did a superb job and I thank them. I would also like to thank Rosemary Martin from Alumni Affairs for promptly suppling us with the list of alumni, which was the sampling frame for this survey.

The responsibility for this report, of course, rests with me.

INTRODUCTION

A sample survey of Business and Administration alumni was undertaken as a class project in Information Systems 333 (Sample Survey) during the Winter semester of 1984. This survey problem was chosen because the class felt it would be of interest to determine alumni attitudes about the University and CSU administrators suggested this topic to assist in the upcoming accreditation review for the College of Business and Administration.

The status of CSU Business and Administration alumni was estimated from data collected via a telephone survey conducted during April and May of 1984. A random sample of 84 alumni was randomly chosen from the list of 509 graduates obtained from the Alumni office. Interviewers consisted of the members of the class who also designed the questionaire (See Table 1). The questionaire was designed to gather information relative to the respondents' major, current employment, salary, graduate work, and ratings of the College and University.

Only graduates from the years 1980 through 1983 were included in this survey. Graduates prior to 1980 were not considered due to their small number (approximately 12). In our stratified sample an equal number of graduates were randomly selected from each of the four years (1980, 1981, 1982, 1983). Information was collected via the telephone using a questionaire with both dichotomous and open-ended questions. The interviewers were instructed to remain unbiased when asking the questions and recording the respondents' answers.

The survey was designed so that inferences about proportions would have an error of less than 0.10, at the 95% confidence level. <u>However</u>, since we were able to contact only 50 of the 84 in the <u>sample(60%</u> response rate) no attempt was made to draw inferences for the population of 509 alumni, but the data are presented and summarized for the <u>sample of 50 responders</u>. This truth, not attempting inferences when faced with large amounts of missing data, should be reported more often. The questionaire used in the survey is shown in Table 1, and the resulting data were entered into a SAS (Statistical Analysis System) data base using the University's IBM computer.

STATISTICAL METHODS

The sample size, point estimation and confidence interval methodologies were those appropriate for a stratified random sample survey from a finite population. See chapter 5 of <u>Elementary Survey Sampling</u> (2nd Edition) by Scheaffer, Mendenhall, and Ott, for instance. That is, we planned to use these methods, but the response rate was only 60% (50 of 84), thus we did not construct confidence intervals or point estimates for the population of 509 alumni. The data are presented and summarized.

The sample size of 84 was chosen because it guarantees that the error in estimating a proportion will be less than 0.10, at the 95 percent confidence level. A larger sample size would have guaranteed a smaller possible error but would have been more costly. After considering the possibilities we opted for N \approx 84.

RESULTS

The 50 respondents were cross-classified according to sex and year of graduation with the following results:

	1980	1981	1982	1983	Total
Male	7	5	6	4	22
Female	3	6	7	12	28
Total	10	11	13	16	50

The data pertaining to each surevey question was cross-classified with the year of graduation and these results follow.

A. What was Your Major?

	1980	1981	1982	1983	Total
Acct.	5	5	7	10	27
Finance	0	1	0	1	2
Mgmt.	1	1	4	3	9
Mktg.	1	1	1	2	5
B&A	2	0	0	0	2
Inf. Sys	s. 1	3	1	0	5
Total	10	11	13	16	50

The percent of graduates who majored in accounting is 54% (27 of 50).

в.	Are	you	Emplo	oyed	in	Your	Major	Field?	

	1980	1981	1982	1983	Total
Yes	7	4	6	5	22
No	3	7	7	11	28
Total	10	11	13	16	50

The percent of graduates employed (answered yes) in their major field is 44% (22 of 50).

с.	How would	you Rank	Chicago State University?
			, 10 = best).

	1980	1981	1982	1983	Total
Above 5	7	8	10	9	34
Below 5	2	3	3	7	15
Total	9	11	13	16	49

The percent of graduates who ranked CSU above 5 is 69% (34 of 49).

D. How would you Rank the College of B&A Courses?

		1980	1981	1982	1983	Total
Above	5	8	9	13	15	45
Below	5	1	2	0	1	4
Total		9	11	13	16	49

The percent of graduates who ranked the College of B&A courses above 5 is 92% (45 of 49).

E. Did you Continue on to Graduate School?

	1980	1981	1982	1983	Total
Yes	0	3	2	1	6
No	10	8	11	15	44
Tota	1 10	11	13	16	50

The percent of graduates who went on to Graduate School is 12% (6 of 50).

F. What is Your Current Salary?

	1980	1981	1982	1983	Total
Above \$20,000	8	6	4	2	20
Below \$20,000	2	5	7	14	28
Total	20	11	11	16	48

The percent of graduates with annual income above \$20,000 is 42% (20 of 48).

Non-respondents in our sample totalled 34. Many attempts (at least 6) were made to contact those graduates who were not available when we first telephoned them. Others did not have listed phone numbers or had incorrect numbers. These problems need to be resolved for future surveys.

CONCLUSION

The number of female graduates in the College of B&A has increased steadily since 1980. There were half as many females as males in 1980, but three times as many females as males in 1983. This is an increase from 30% to 75% by 1983.

A little over half the students graduated in the field of accounting; and the accounting graduates were in the majority each of the four years. However, less than half of the graduates are currently employed in their major field of study. Also only 12% or one out of seven of the graduates went on to graduate school. There were none from the class of 1980, and only 3 from 1981, 2 from 1982, and 1 from 1983.

More than half of the graduates said they earned above \$20,000 annually. Not surprisingly, the majority of those were from the year 1980. One of the respondents was unemployed, and another did not answer this question.

Also, not surprisingly, the non-response problem was greatest for 1980 and least for 1983. This problem is mainly due to lack of correct phone numbers or addresses and needs to be resolved for future surveys, in order that we may draw inferences for the entire population.

TABLE 1 Conducted by INSY 333 (April 1984) College of Business and Administration Chicago State University Chicago, IL 60628 Todays Date Person Called Year of Grad Address Phone Number Interviewer Initials 1. What was your major(s) at CSU? 2. Are you presently employed in Yes No DNA* your major area? 3. Please mark the value of your CSU degree on a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 = very poor and 10 = excellent. 4. Please rank the value of your CSU Business and Administration courses on a scale from 1 to 10. 5. Have you received a graduate Yes No DNA* degree (Master, MBA, or Ph.D) since you graduated from Chicago State University. 5a. (If no to 5) Are you presently Yes No DNA* working on a graduate degree. ____ ___ 6. What is your current occupation? 7. Who is your present employer?

8. Would you categorize your present annual income as below or () Below \$20,000 above \$20,000. () Above \$20,000 () DNA*

*DNA (Did not answer) is a possible response to every question