To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Sharon Kaye Allred entitled "Competencies of Word Processing Employees As Perceived By Word Processing Supervisors and Business Educators." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Business Education.

John J. Stallard

John J. Stallard, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Betty J. Brown

Arnold Reese

Accepted for the Council:

L Evans Peel

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
78
.A468
Cop. 2.

COMPETENCIES OF WORD PROCESSING EMPLOYEES AS PERCEIVED BY WORD PROCESSING SUPERVISORS AND BUSINESS EDUCATORS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Sharon Kaye Allred

December 1978

1271004

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. John J. Stallard for his guidance and assistance in the planning and writing of my thesis. Gratitude is also expressed to the other members of my Master's committee, Dr. Betty Brown and Dr. Donald Reese. Recognition is also given to Mrs. Helen Henry.

Acknowledgment is made of the contributions of the word processing supervisors and business educators who provided information for this study.

Also appreciated are my friends for their understanding and encouragement during the preparation of this thesis. Finally, a special thanks is extended to my parents who have always encouraged and supported me in every aspect of my life.

ABSTRACT

The problem of this study was to determine those competencies which should be taught to prospective word processing employees. To delineate this problem, answers to questions concerning competencies currently included in word processing textbooks and the perceptions of word processing supervisors and business educators regarding those competencies were sought.

The design of this study was basically a descriptive empirical type of survey. Questionnaires were distributed to a selective sample of 25 word processing supervisors and 25 business educators located throughout the United States.

Fifty word processing competencies were identified by the investigator and included in the survey instrument. The results of the study showed that 25, 52 percent, of the competencies were perceived to be important by a majority of the supervisors and educators. Twelve competencies were personnel-oriented, 2 competencies were equipment-oriented, and 12 competencies were procedures-oriented. Of the 50 word processing competencies, 14, 28 percent, were significantly different at the .05 level in responses by the word processing supervisors and business educators.

Major conclusions reached in the study were:

1. Prospective word processing employees should develop people-oriented competencies as they relate to word processing terminology; responsibilities of word processing supervisors; effective communication

methods; analysis, synthesis, and prioritization of in-basket materials; responsibilities of word originators; salary administration of word processing personnel; methods for orienting/training word processing personnel; efficiency in performance of correspondence function; efficiency in performance of administrative support function; methods for promoting job satisfaction; and occupational outlook for word processing systems.

2. Prospective word processing employees should develop equipment-oriented competencies as they relate to the identification and proficient operation of input/output equipment.

3. Prospective word processing employees should develop procedures-oriented competencies as they relate to the purpose of word processing; methods of origination; methods for conducting feasibility studies; centralization and decentralization of word processing systems; efficiency in "flow of work;" methods for improving dictation/transcription cycle; alternative solutions for alleviating conversion problems; current and anticipated demand for word processing technological developments and procedures; records management concept; analysis of various types of documents to enhance output methods; methods for measuring employee performance; and analysis of various types of business forms for their cost-cutting potential.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Rationale for the Study	2
	Definition of Terms	4
	Limitations	5
	Methods and Procedures	6
	Organization of the Study	9
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
	Word Processing: Advantages	11
	Word Processing: Disadvantages	18
	Review of Related Research	24
III.	ANALYSES OF THE DATA	31
	Personnel-Oriented Competencies	31
	Equipment-Oriented Competencies	46
	Procedures-Oriented Competencies	55
IV.	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	69
	Findings	70
	Conclusions	73
	Recommendations	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY		75
APPENDICES		79
	APPENDIX A	80
	APPENDIX B	86
	APPENDIX C	93
VITA		96

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the origin of the word processing concept in 1964 by Ulrich Steinhilper, a German office products manager, business educators, and business people have struggled to understand and implement this revolutionary idea. Papers, pamphlets, articles, and books have emerged to propose definitions and explanations to guide those in education and management. Perhaps for some, the concepts, and meanings surrounding word processing are completely understood. However, the word processing concept is still a rather new area in business which for many remains unexplainable and frequently misinterpreted.

Business educators have the responsibility of producing professionally competent students who are capable of efficient and knowledgeable decision making in their respective roles. To meet this challenge, existing curriculums must be revised in order that prospective office employees will be prepared to cope with situations involving such innovative and progressive ideas as word processing. For effective learning to take place, teachers must recognize, understand, and accept those competencies necessary for successful employment of their students in a word processing environment.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of this study was to determine those competencies which should be taught to prospective word processing employees. In order

to delineate these competencies, it was necessary to answer the following questions:

1. What competencies are identified in three of the most recently published word processing textbooks which are being used for collegiate-level instruction?

2. What competencies are perceived as important by business educators and word processing supervisors who are currently teaching/supervising in the area of processing?

3. Do business word processing supervisors agree with the business educators as to the importance of the perceived competencies?

II. RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

As increasing emphasis is placed on a systems approach for many of the functional divisions of organizational design, so evolves a systems approach for office paperwork known as word processing. Regardless of the negative attitudes maintained by some educators concerning this fascinating new area, the fact remains that word processing is here to stay. Hulbert writes that:

> During the past few years, word processing has exploded into one of the country's fastest growing industries. Recent nationwide surveys indicate that 30 percent of companies employing over one hundred workers now use word processing equipment, and the development of word processing systems will increase dramatically in the near future. The establishment of the International Word Processing Association in 1972 and the appearance of increasing numbers of journal articles about word processing also portent the significance of this concept for offices of the future.[1]

---

[1] Jack E. Hulbert, "Preparing Students for Word Processing Careers," *Journal of Business Education*, January 1977, p. 157.

George E. Pake, head of Xerox Corporation's Research Center in Palo Alto, California, contended that word processing will change the office "like the jet plane has revolutionized travel and the way TV has altered family life."[2] Likewise, James Mills, president of Royal Typewriter Company, encouraged speculation that "word processing will be bigger than data processing in ten years."[3]

Despite significant indications favoring widespread acceptance of the word processing concept, it seems that the average business teacher is still "painfully unaware of the true meaning of word processing."[4] The role of the multifunctional secretary is disappearing, and businessmen demand that students be skillful in performing the duties associated with current technological advancements. Bely stated:

> The traditional secretarial studies program is becoming obsolete and is creating an unrealistic hope for its students. Graduating young people are ill-prepared to meet the future needs of the business world.[5]

Because of the impact of word processing on traditionally accepted methods and procedures in the typical office, business educators are forced to take into careful consideration curriculum changes necessary to promote effective learning and employable skills among business students.

---

[2]"The Office of the Future," *Business Week*, June 30, 1975, p. 48.

[3]Ibid., p. 53.

[4]Rosanne Reiff, "A New and Different Look at Word Processing," *Journal of Business Education*, May 1975, p. 331.

[5]Jeanette L. Bely, "Word Processing and Its Implications on Stenography," *The Balance Sheet*, April 1973, p. 293.

Rosen commented that:

> Slowly but cautiously schools and colleges across the country are recognizing the thrust of the word processing industry and are formulating plans to provide qualified people trained in the skills and concepts of word processing. They are going to their educational drawing boards and trying to design a prototype curriculum that will serve their particular needs.[6]

Once instructors understand and accept the relevance of the word processing concept as an essential element of curricular activities, the critical issue then becomes the identification of valid components which should be included in word processing instruction. Unfortunately, the diversity of opinions which exists between educators and businessmen creates the necessity for continued research to produce valid information to aid teachers and administrators in planning acceptable programs.

In order to increase the probability of more effective program planning at the collegiate level, this study identified those competencies perceived by word processing educators and supervisors to be necessary for purposeful classroom instruction. The efforts of this study may partially alleviate the problem of uncertainty experienced by those who are attempting to update and upgrade existing office programs.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following are definitions of terms used in this study:

1. *Administrative Secretaries* refer to those who perform nontyping activities such as filing, scheduling, and researching as a supportive service to management and other professional personnel.

---

[6]Arnold Rosen, "Models for Word Processing Curricula," *Words*, Winter 1977-78, p. 37.

2. *Author Educator* refers to one who has published articles or written books in the area of word processing.

3. *Competencies* refer to knowledges, skills, and/or abilities required for satisfactory performance of a specified task.

4. *Correspondence Secretaries* refer to those who are responsible for typing activities involving the use of automated word processing equipment.

5. *Word Processing* refers to efficiency in transforming verbal or written ideas into usable form through the management of specialized personnel, modern computerized equipment, and systematic procedures.

6. *Word Processing Centers* refer to the centralized or decentralized location of specialists who operate modern computerized word processing equipment.

7. *Word Processing Supervisors* refer to those who are responsible for directing the work of specialized personnel employed in the word processing center.

IV. LIMITATIONS

The limitations of the study were as follows:

1. Three of the most recently published word processing textbooks were the primary sources for the identification of competencies included in the questionnaire.

2. The researcher was interested only in gathering data concerned with perceptions of the sampled population. No attempt was made to collect demographic data or other personal information.

3. The researcher did not gather data related to company size or the extent to which a "pure" word processing system was established. Likewise, no questions were included for the purpose of describing types or brands of equipment utilized by word processing personnel.

4. A convenience sample was used for this study which was comprised of 25 Business Educators and 25 Word Processing Supervisors. The educators who comprised the researcher's population were limited to those identified as contributors to the literature in word processing or those known to be teaching word processing. The supervisors were selected from a list of registrants who attended a fall symposium of the International Word Processing Association in Dallas, Texas, in October 1976. Each of the supervisors was involved with the management of Word Processing centers for their respective companies.

V. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The design of this study was basically a descriptive empirical type of survey. Data for the survey were secured through the use of a questionnaire. The following sections describe the sources, methods, and procedures used in collection and treatment of the data. Section V is organized in the following manner: development of the instrument; selection of the population and sample; and analysis of the data.

Development of the Instrument

The preliminary word processing competencies were identified in three of the most recently published word processing textbooks, listed in Appendix A. Based upon the investigator's research and synthesis of the

word processing concept, the competencies were categorized into one of three areas: personnel, equipment, and procedures. In the final draft of the survey instrument, however, the investigator used groupings of five for easier reading, instead of the three broad categories.

The chairman of the researcher's committee critiqued the initial list of 67 competencies, after which the instrument was given to the candidate's committee members for review and verification. As two of the three committee members were currently involved in word processing instruction at The University of Tennessee, they critically evaluated the competencies. Based upon their comments and suggestions, the list of competencies was revised.

The proposed questionnaire was given to graduate students enrolled in the Business Education program at The University of Tennessee for suggestions for improvement. According to their reactions to the survey instrument, additional refinement was necessary. Based upon the faculty member's and the graduate students' critical analyses of the questionnaire, the final instrument included 50 competencies to which word processing supervisors and business educators would be asked to respond. (Appendix A)

Selection of the Population and the Sample

In order to compile a list of business educators throughout the United States who were currently teaching word processing, the investigator researched business education periodicals to identify author educators to whom questionnaires could be submitted. Additional business educators were included as suggested by the writer's committee chairman. Authors of the three word processing textbooks used for identification of the

competencies were also included in the educator population. A convenience sample of 25 business educators was established. (Appendix B)

The word processing supervisor population was composed of registrants for a fall symposium of the International Word Processing Association in Dallas, Texas, in October 1976. The researcher selectively chose 25 supervisors throughout the United States from among the list of those attending. *The Dun and Bradstreet Million Dollar Directory* was used for company locations and addresses. The list of supervisors contacted is shown in Appendix B.

In the initial mailing of the survey on May 19, 1978, a cover letter (Appendix C) accompanied the questionnaire requesting that the supervisors/educators complete the instrument and return it by June 2, 1978. From the original distribution of the survey instrument, the researcher received 26 responses, a 52 percent return (13 supervisors and 13 educators). A follow-up letter (Appendix C) was mailed on June 8, 1978 to the remaining 24 supervisors/educators who had not responded. Three additional responses were received from the business educators and two additional responses from the word processing supervisors. A total of 31 responses was received, a 62 percent return. Of those who were invited to participate, two (one educator and one supervisor) were no longer employed at the location to which the questionnaire was mailed, one company responded that they were not involved in word processing, one educator chose not to participate, and two educators returned the completed questionnaire after the data had been analyzed.

Analysis of the Data

The data were analyzed by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer analysis program available through The University of Tennessee Computing Center. Classification of the competencies for Chi-Square analysis were type (Supervisor or Educator) and response (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5). Computations were based on the expected frequencies of the five responses (Unimportant, Of Some Importance, Important, Very Important, Extremely Important) occurring in the Supervisor group and the Educator group.

The first category, labeled "Unimportant," could not logically be combined/collapsed with any other category. However, when the expected frequency of a 2 (Of Some Importance) or 3 (Important) response was less than 5, the cells were combined. When the expected frequency of a 4 (Very Important) or 5 (Extremely Important) response was less than 5, the cells were combined. This combining/collapsing of cells resulted in Chi-Square being computed for the competencies with one, two, or three degrees of freedom.

VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study is presented in the following sequence:

Chapter I includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, rationale for the study, definition of terms, limitations of the study, methods and procedures, and the organization of the study.

Chapter II includes a review of literature with an overview of the advantages and the disadvantages of implementing a word processing system and a review of related studies.

Chapter III includes the analysis of the data.

Chapter IV includes findings, conclusions, and recommendations made as a result of the study.

Appendix A contains a list of the word processing textbooks used for identifying the competencies included in the questionnaire and a copy of the survey instrument; Appendix B contains a list of the word processing supervisors and business educators included in the sample population; and Appendix C contains a copy of the cover letter and the follow-up letter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature on word processing is reported in professional magazines, in texts, and in research studies. It is important to recognize the benefits which can result from establishing a word processing system as well as the undesirable outcomes which might accrue. The following two sections of this chapter include an overview of the advantages and disadvantages of implementing a word processing system. The final section includes a review of research studies which relate to the present investigation.

I. WORD PROCESSING: ADVANTAGES

What is so bad about the traditional secretarial setup? It has been an established, accepted part of the business scene for the better part of a century. What is the problem?

Walter A Kleinschrod,[1] who is credited as being one of the first business journalists in America to alert the business community to the concepts and potential of word processing, attacked the preceding questions forcefully and with rigid conciseness. He described the traditional secretary-boss arrangement as inefficient, wasteful, and boring. Kleinschrod continued by stating that it comes as a shock to some executives to realize that there are more effective ways of utilizing personal secretaries who

---

[1]Walter A Kleinschrod, *Management's Guide to Word Processing*, The Dartnell Corporation (1975), pp. 9-16.

obediently sit behind a desk and wait for the next assignment. He cited the following examples as arguments to justify the use of the word processing concept as an efficient, conservative alternative to achieve increased productivity and lower costs:

> Thomas Quinn (Toledo Edison Co.) says that operators in his new WP center each produce an average of from 500 to 800 types lines per day which contrasts with the 250 to 300 lines per day previously produced by typists at individual work stations. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> James Gallagher (General Electric, Erie, PA) estimates that WP has produced savings of $40,000 per editing keyboard per year in clerical overhead and executives' time. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Lever Brothers (New York) now rely on the specialization of ten employees to handle the work previously done by 42 workers. The ten are WP pro's who replaced row upon row of typists in a pool. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> South Central Bell Telephone Co. (New Orleans) upped document output from 50 to 100 percent and pocketed savings of $21,000 during its first year under WP. In one episode, Bell executives asked the center to prepare 500 original letters, two and a half pages long, with no erasures. Under the old method, with six regular typists, the task would have taken about six and a half days. With the new setup, six operators, each working with a text-editing typewriter, were able to finish the job in nine hours. Time saved was 31.8 clerical days.

In conclusion, Kleinschrod indicated that Bruce Payne and Associates, management consultants who have pioneered in word processing work measurement, offer about the closest thing to an overall expected estimated average savings. Their research shows that the implementation of the word processing concept can usually result in savings of from $120,000 to $240,000, or 15 to 30 percent of clerical payroll and overhead, for each 100 work stations placed under the program.

The results of a survey by management consultant Robert Shiff[2] supported Kleinschrod's opinions. Shiff polled 53 secretaries in one

---

[2]Shiff, op. cit., p. 10.

department of a large organization to determine how their time was allocated. Waiting for work was one of the biggest "duplications of effort" he found among the secretarial staff. Furthermore, he cited the traditional secretary's duties as being random, generalized, and grossly unstructured. Shiff contended that a word processing system rearranges the traditional multifunctional secretarial position into a more controlled and purposeful pattern, thus eliminating the random, generalized, hit-and-miss completion of assignments. Two separate functions (correspondence secretaries for typing responsibilities and administrative secretaries for non-typing responsibilities) enhance productivity through division of labor and employee specialization.

Harold Tepper,[3] a senior staff consultant at Naremco Services, Inc., presented findings from studies conducted by his firm. Again, the results emphasized the major negative impact of private-secretarial relationships. Tepper cited secretarial-related problems as being extremely costly to business organizations in terms of wasted labor charges and low levels of service. Specifically, the findings indicated that such problems as (1) low levels of productivity, (2) inability to satisfy large-scale priority typing requests, (3) less than full-time availability to the executives and managers they serve, and (4) low employee motivation were a direct result of one-boss-one-secretary arrangements. Parallelling Shiff's findings, Tepper also found that a substantial percentage of the private secretary's time can be tagged "waiting-for-work" time or idle time. He

---

[3]Harold Tepper, "The Private Secretary: A Company Liability," *Management Review*, February 1973, pp. 24-42.

illustrated this problem by giving as an example two company departments from his survey whose idle time was represented by 47 private secretaries. A figure of 32 percent waiting-for-work time was recorded, which converted to 15.04 lost man-years, or $126,000 a year in wasted salary and fringe benefits. Since 47 secretaries represented the secretarial staff of only two departments of an international multidivision company, the total cost of company-wide lost time was estimated as more than one million dollars. Furthermore, since the company had no work standards for the secretarial staff, management had no yardstick for acceptable productivity levels.

Tepper challenged the generally accepted idea that the traditional private secretary is motivated but, because of job specialization, a correspondence or administrative secretary is not. Using Herzberg's six-factor model of employee motivation, he refuted management's long-time claims of the multifunctional secretary's high morale and substantial job satisfaction. The factors studied were these:

1. *Achievement and the work itself.* The work content of the private-secretarial position is generally routine, intellectually unchallenging, and void of providing real opportunity for achievement.

2. *Recognition.* Because most companies express recognition of an employee's work by pay increases, long-time private secretaries eventually find themselves at the top of the secretarial salary scale. In one company studied, 37 percent of the secretaries were in this position. Based on Herzberg's theory, therefore, it becomes clear that the private-secretarial position is prone to low levels of motivation.

3. *Growth and responsibility.* Once a secretarial position becomes established, it does not vary significantly in job content. Growth potential as well as potential for increased responsibility is limited.

4. *Advancement.* Most often, private secretaries remain at a fixed level of responsibility for their entire working careers. This lack of opportunity for advancement, Herzberg has found, negatively affects employee motivation.

Additional problem-causing factors included resentment of inequitable work distribution among secretaries as well as misuse and poor utilization of secretarial skills and abilities. Resentment and dissatisfaction were found to be the outcome of uneven secretarial work loads caused by the particular executives being served and supported. To add to the frustration, the office manager seldom had direct authority to assign and monitor secretarial work time to create more beneficial orgainization patterns. Perhaps the greatest inefficiency resulted, however, from ineffective use of the secretary's individual talents. Anne Montgomery,[4] a Dartnell editor, suggested the probability of overwhelming benefits for the executive who "dares" to extend more responsibility to the well-qualified, self-sufficient secretary. She said:

> Benefits are obvious. The manager wouldn't be as concerned with those irritating details. The secretary's job would be enriched. And the company would be getting many tasks performed at a lower rate of pay, as well as more time devoted to work with more impact on the firm's fortunes.

---

[4]John H. Carson, "Your Secretary: Robot or Management Aide?" *Industry Week*, July 1972, pp. 33-37.

Word processing systems composed of correspondence and administrative support more efficiently use previously unused potential.

Alexander S. Beller,[5] branch manager for IBM in Washington, D. C., also emphasized maximum utilization of company employees--especially clerical personnel. He identified the word processing concept as extremely advantageous because it (1) makes possible realistic, definable career paths in the clerical environment, (2) introduces the idea of functional management into the secretarial area, (3) permits the organization to establish functional job descriptions for clerical employees, and (4) brings about a transference of loyalty to the goals of the organization. He described an effective word processing system as a synergistic concept, successfully established through the proper manipulation of equipment, procedures, and the all-important personnel. Word processing can help improve morale, reduce attrition, and achieve better management control of people, a critical resource.

Margaret H. Dillion,[6] CPS and former president of the National Secretaries Association, described word processing as a "savior." Perhaps, she suggested, the "do everything" secretary has been spreading herself too thinly. Word processing lightens the secretary's burden and broadens her opportunities by segregating functions and creating two distinct

---

[5]Alexander S. Beller, "Much More Than Hardware," *Office System 6 Management Seminar*, International Business Machines Corporation, 1977.

[6]Margaret H. Dillon, "End of Beginning?" *Office System 6 Management Seminar*, International Business Machines Corporation, 1977

specialists where none previously existed. A word processing secretary is no longer tied to the career of her boss but has alternative paths to which she can match her particular skills, abilities, and personality. Contrasting the correspondence and administrative functions, Dillon commented:

> Instead of just typing her boss' dictation, the administrative secretary creates some of her own while performing other executive-like functions. Preferring the mechanical aspect of the system, the correspondence secretary becomes the production arm of the word processing cycle and is considered no less creative than her administrative counterpart. The correspondence secretary supplies the brainpower and initiative to format the end product. Therefore, word processing offers the secretary an opportunity to grow where she excels.

Dillon concluded by predicting that word processing will raise the standards of the professional secretary. There is good reason to expect that the specialized roles created by word processing will become the basis for advances in productivity, individual achievement, and personal satisfaction.

Looking to the future, word processing promises to revolutionize the business office through its forecasted merging with electronic data processing. Robert Greenblatt,[7] an independent consultant based in New York City, specializes in data and word processing integration. He suggests that the introduction of the computer on the word processing scene will accelerate the initial integration of data and word processing. Greenblatt predicted that word processing applications will probably center around three types of computing systems: (1) the standalone minicomputer,

---

[7]Robert Greenblatt, "Forecast for DP/WP Integration," *Word Processing*, September/October 1976, p. 10.

the system currently in widest use for WP applications, (2) the shared logic system, which is a minicomputer capable of supporting peripheral devices such as terminals, and (3) the time sharing system, a computer capable of supporting many users and many applications. With implementation of a WP/DP integrated system, administrative secretaries would take on a paraprofessional role, absorbing more delegated management responsibilities. The correspondence secretary will find assignments varying between word and data processing activities. Identifying feasible applications, Greenblatt concluded by saying:

> It is conceivable that in the years to come the total processing effort for systems such as accounting, order entry, inventory control, sales, and financial analysis will be designed to interact with a secretarial staff supported by a computer as well as word processing equipment. It is my opinion that the integration of word processing and data processing will be the beginning of a "futuristic" office environment.

II. WORD PROCESSING: DISADVANTAGES

Ironically, many of the factors considered to be advantages of word processing may also be viewed as unconquered problems. Perhaps no other person has been a more outspoken critic of the word processing concept than industrial psychologist, William Penzer. His initial argument identified job specialization as the cause for dull, boring and monotonous activity. He stated that:

> . . . the need for variety is an inherent aspect of the human condition. Under conditions of repetitive work, why should people be motivated toward high achievement? Rationality dictates that in such circumstances motivation becomes directed toward escaping tedium.[8]

---

[8]William N. Penzer, "The Mechanization of Emily," *Administrative Management*, January 1974, pp. 52-58.

He argued that in a traditional role, a secretary has a wide-ranging job, rich in variety. Separation of secretarial tasks will strip the administrative secretary of her highly prized typing skills and at the same time rob the correspondence secretary of activities which are more people-oriented. Penzer commented that division of labor can have serious morale and performance implications on both sides of the word processing fence.

What about all the impressive talk of attractive, modern, often plush facilities in which to work? Penzer described these centers as nothing more than glorified typing pools which are no substitute for challenging, meaningful, and stimulating work. Penzer attacked the word processing advocates' claims that traditional secretaries are not given meaningful objectives, are not appropriately evaluated, are inconsistently recognized, and are seldom encouraged or allowed to aspire to higher levels of responsibility and achievement by their superiors. He contended that an additional managerial level (WP supervisors/managers) will create an unhealthy environment of dual loyalty, resulting in the imposition of double standards on the secretary. Since the secretary in a word processing system will probably lose direct contact with the principal whom she serves, a communication breakdown may result in otherwise unnecessary retyping of the job assignment, personal conflict, and bad feelings.

In conclusion, Penzer pointed out a major negative factor to consider before implementing a word processing system--the depersonalization of the secretary. The traditional secretary learns to take pride in her work as the result of a one-to-one relationship with a boss whom she strives to please. Penzer emphasized the importance of the "social

components" of work and their positive impact on morale and satisfaction.

Cost is a major factor which discourages many prospective users of word processing systems. Expenditures may include the investment for feasibility studies, reassignment of personnel where necessary, training and retraining of present and prospective employees, purchase of equipment, and alterations of established methods and procedures.[9]

Richard E. Eichhorn, executive vice president of CPT Corporation, urged potential buyers to take a "double-barreled shot" of responsibility to make decisions based on sound, logical, unbiased knowledge. Referring to the projected integration of word processing and data processing, he encouraged users to benefit from the mistakes of those who suffered severely during the birth and emergence of data processing. Eichhorn described his experience in the following way:

> As a sales representative in data processing in 1961, I had firsthand experience of the growing pains experienced by the individual. In those days, the manufacturer would conduct a quickie survey and tell the data processing managers what equipment they needed. This pitting of naive data processing users against the more aggressive, overzealous hardware salesmen produced many data processing installations that were well equipped with the latest gadgetry but were usually very inefficient.[10]

He warned that although vendors may be very competent and extremely well-meaning, they are (1) still not as informed about the questioned operation

---

[9]Gilbert J. Konkel and Phyllis J. Peck, *The Word Processing Explosion,* Office Publications, Inc., 1976, p. 8.

[10]Richard E. Eichhorn, "A Vendor Doesn't Walk on Water," *Words,* Winter, 1977-78, pp. 12-13.

as the potential user, (2) do not have the time to critically observe the system for a more in-depth understanding, and (3) will offer biased advice and suggestions because of the individual product lines they happen to represent.

Penny Young, manager of IBM's Office Products Division, provided additional insight into a typical problem experienced by many word processing customers. They display a lack of knowledge which hinders their ability to make purchases and implement programs. The problem seems to be that buyers insist on vendor expertise to the point that standard or universal answers and explanations are readily available. According to Young, the answer lies in understanding and identifying individual differences and needs, a concept which makes impossible the one-size-fits-all design of system implementation. She wrote:

> Does word processing mean more and better career paths? It It depends! It depends on the WP objectives of what is to be accomplished, of what kind of people with what kind of skills are needed to accomplish it, and their ability to hire, train and promote accordingly. It is through successful people/job fit that word processing promotes job satisfaction for the employee and better resource utilization for the company.[11]

Resistance to change is, of course, a major obstacle and a potential drawback for conversion to a word processing setup. Ms. Randy Goldfield, vice-president of Word Processing Associates, Inc., New York, explained a typical executive's viewpoint:

> Although rationally, a change to WP may make sense, an executive's private secretary may represent more to him than efficiency or convenience. His judgement often rests on what

---

[11] Penny Young, "Career Path Questions--No Standard Answers," *Word Processing*, March/April 1977, pp. 3-6.

> are emotional values. Non-objective? Yes, but nonetheless real in presenting a potential obstacle to successful adoption of WP.[12]

Goldfield cited the research of Dr. Lane Riland, Director of Psychological Research and Services, Eastman Kodak. In a survey at a large manufacturing organization, executives were asked to rate the importance to their work of having a private secretary. Almost without exception, the executives felt having their own secretary was essential to their work. The same survey then asked each of them for a breakdown of the part of each work-day in which the secretary was used. Almost without exception, none of the executives used their secretaries for the greater part of each day. Riland attributed the executives' insistence on private secretaries to comfort, security, and status. Likewise, private secretaries are just as apprehensive about changing routine patterns. Traditionally, a secretary's status and salary have been entirely dependent on who her boss was. Word processing, in contrast, is based on viewing the secretary as an independent professional, one whose pay is based directly on her skills and performance. To a secretary whose entire career has been spent in the shadow of her boss, the promise of an independent career can appear to be a loss of status.

Morrison discussed one of the major problems of the word processing concept:

> We in business education must make our students aware of emerging pitfalls in the current move toward office specialization and not prepare them blindly for just any job no matter what effect that job may have upon the individual's psyche. With the emergence of secretarial specialists as

---

[12]"Successfully Planning the Human Side of Word Processing," *Office System 6 Management Seminar*, International Business Machines Corporation, 1977.

> the vital cog in a word processing system, many young secretarial aspirants may find their "work style" meshed with "assembly line" office roles in a mechanized environment.[13]

As secretarial personnel become professional specialists, the repetitive routine nature of the work demands creativity on the part of supervisors in the area of morale-boosting incentives to promote job satisfaction. "With the current emphasis on the adoption of technological methodology," stated Morrison, "there appears to be a human trade-off in the name of progress." He cited the concern of Gerald Hershey, who said:

> There appears to be some inconsistency in the argument that the correspondence secretary should be rather alert and intelligent while at the same time suggesting that the correspondence secretary will be motivated on a long-term basis by rather mechanistic, routine, and repetitive activities. How long can a manager expect an eductated and alert person to continue as an operator of an automatic typewriter?[14]

Zane K. Quible, author and educator, identified "lack of job satisfaction" as a critical area of concern. His findings indicated that pressure of the job, the repetitive nature of work, lack of familiarity with word originators, lack of involvement with other employees, and lack of promotion opportunities contributed to the increasing problems of job boredom, monotony, and dissatisfaction.[15]

---

[13]James L. Morrison, "A Human Trade-Off for Word Processing Specialists," *Balance Sheet*, February 1974, pp. 196-98.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Zane K. Quible, *Introduction to Administrative Office Management*, Winthrop Publishers, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., 1977, p. 182.

III. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The purpose of this section is to review related theses and dissertations pertaining to the present investigation. Five research studies were included in the review in order to examine methods, procedures, survey techniques, and findings as they relate to the present study.

Herbert Study[1]

The purpose of Hebert's study was to compare the perceptions and differences in perceptions of business education authorities and practicing teachers of the importance of specified competencies to be demonstrated by beginning typewriting instructors. Reactionaires were given to both groups for their ratings of the competency statements. These competency statements were categorized in three areas: the practitioner's basis, a philosophical basis, and an instructional basis.

The Delphi technique was used in gathering data from the authorities and the classroom teachers. The instrument included three reactionaires sent to the two groups for their ranking of the competencies. The Chi-Square test was used to analyze the data. Significance was determined at the .05 level of the competency statements which were common to the two groups.

The results of the study produced a set of competencies which may be used in initiating a program in Competency-Based Teacher Education in Business Education for the teacher of beginning typewriting.

---

[1]Margaret Hebert, "Analysis of Competencies Needed by Typewriting Teachers as Perceived by Business Teachers and by Authorities in Business Education," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Houston, 1973).

Hebert's study is related to the present study in that she compared the perceptions of two sampled populations to determine valid competencies for enhancing instructional methods. Hebert used a Likert-type attitude scale for the collection of data, as did this researcher. Chi-Square analysis was performed to determine significance for the competencies which were common to the two groups.

Powell Study[2]

The Powell study was designed to determine the competencies needed by new employees working in firms where a word processing system was in operation. Specifically, the importance of certain skills/knowledge/attitudes of employees entering the word processing system were investigated. Forty-five subject areas commonly or possibly included in a secretarial program were evaluated for their importance in training correspondence and administrative secretaries.

Questionnaires were submitted to managers of word processing systems, supervisors of word processing centers, and correspondence and administrative secretaries. The criteria used by the respondents to evaluate the subject areas were determined by a three-point scale. Twenty-five firms in the Metropolitan Denver, Colorado, area participated in the study.

Major findings of the study were that (1) all secretarial programs should include information and guidance on the word processing concept;

---

[2]Merton E. Powell, "The Modern Automated Word Processing System--Its Implications for Changes in the Curriculum for Business and Office Education," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Montana, 1975).

(2) training on the magnetic media typewriters in schools was not considered critical, but preparation for changing conditions and procedures was; and (3) greater emphasis should be given to teaching English grammer, spelling, proper attitudes towards work, ability to get along with others, and excellence in performing all basic secretarial skills.

Powell's study and the present study both compared the perceptions and differences in perceptions of business personnel in order to identify competencies needed by word processing employees. As in the present study, Powell's findings had significant implications for the secretarial curriculum.

Reiff Study[3]

Reiff conducted a study to determine the requirements for entry-level employment in word processing centers in New York City, to determine the attitudes of word processors toward their jobs, and to make recommendations for secondary school business education curricula in the New York Metropolitan area.

The data were obtained by investigating the word processing centers of 30 business organizations in New York City and administering three validated instruments within those firms. The Interview Guide was administered to management personnel. The Survey for Correspondence

---

[3]Rosanne Reiff, "Entry-Level Job Qualifications and Employee Attitudes in New York City Word Processing Centers and Implications for Secondary School Business Education Curricula in the New York Metropolitan Area," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, 1974).

Secretaries and the Survey for Administrative Secretaries both contained attitude scales on which the respective secretaries indicated their attitudes toward specific aspects of word processing. Another validated instrument, the Word Processing Checklist for Teachers, was completed by Metropolitan New York Area secondary school business educators who taught the skills and/or the concepts of word processing. They checked those aspects of the word processing environment toward which they oriented their students.

These are the major findings of the Reiff study:

1. The overall potential for word processing appears to be favorable.
2. The majority of business educators are not familiar with the concept of word processing. Of the group that is familiar with the concept of word processing, most do not teach the skills per se; a small segment teaches one or more of the environmental concepts.
3. Replies by correspondence and administrative secretaries to a total of 18 out of 37 items in their respective survey indicated favorable attitudes toward specific aspects of the word processing environment.
4. Although most current secondary school business education curricular guidelines in the New York Metropolitan area do not include instruction in word processing skills per se, some of the minimum qualifications necessary for employment in entry-level positions in word processing centers in New York City may be achieved within the current curricula.
5. No one specific pattern of word processing organization was followed by the sampled firms. Each company had adopted the variations best suited to meet its own individual needs.

As in the present study, Reiff utilized a Likert-type attitude scale for the collection of data. Reiff also sought to compare the perceptions of business personnel with those of business educators to obtain validated indications concerning the revision of existing course content.

Saliba Study[4]

The Saliba study was conducted to determine the types of word processing equipment being used in businesses in Dothan, Alabama, and to determine the types of job tasks performed by word processing equipment operators. A secondary purpose was to determine the competencies needed by word processing employees. Questionnaires were distributed to a selective sample of 141 business and industrial firms in Dothan, Alabama.

The major conclusions reached in the study were:

1. The basic type of dictating/transcribing equipment used in Dothan, Alabama, businesses is discrete media.
2. In-house training is the most effective means for training personnel to use word processing equipment.
3. The major job tasks of business correspondence are basically processed through the use of magnetic card, automatic repetitive, and communicating typewriters.
4. Prospective word processing employees should develop their competencies in the following areas: telephone techniques, composition, ability to proofread, knowledge of grammar, accuracy, speed, correcting neatly, numerical typing, setting priorities on work, management of time, research techniques, and working under pressure.
5. People-oriented activities and the psychology of dealing with people are essential attributes of word processing personnel.

The present study and the Saliba study are related in that each researcher used a Likert-type attitude scale for the collection of data and the Chi-Square for analysis of the information. Both researchers also conducted surveys in order to provide criteria for improved curricular design.

---

[4]Amy Saliba, "Word Processing--Status of Equipment and Role Expectations of Employees in Dothan, Alabama, Business Firms," (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1978).

Smiley Study[5]

The primary purpose of the Smiley study was to identify the accounting concepts that should be and are included in the instructional program of first-year accounting on the high school level and on the post-secondary school level. A secondary purpose was to compare the concepts taught on the high school level with those taught on the post-secondary level with the objective of achieving a closer articulation between the two accounting courses.

Eighty-nine concepts included in the subject matter of the first-year accounting course were identified through an examination of first-year high school and first-year post-secondary accounting textbooks. Once identified, the 89 concepts were arranged in a questionnaire format and mailed to authors of the books examined. This Jury of Experts was requested to validate the list of concepts as well as indicate the importance of the concepts and the level on which the concepts should be taught. This process resulted in 81 of the 89 statements being judged as concepts by a majority of the Jury of Experts.

The 81 validated concepts were then presented to a sample of high school and post-secondary teachers of first-year accounting in an effort to determine whether the concepts were actually being taught on the level of schooling as indicated by the authors. Also, the two groups of teachers were asked to rank each concept.

---

[5]James M. Smiley, "The Identification and Comparison of Accounting Concepts That Should be and are Included in the Course Content of the First-Year High School and Post-Secondary Accounting Courses," (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1972).

As Smiley identified concepts from accounting textbooks, this researcher identified competencies from word processing textbooks. As in the present study, findings were the result of comparing selected populations to determine degrees of agreement or disagreement in order to establish competencies of word processing personnel.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSES OF THE DATA

The data were based on the responses to questionnaires collected from word processing supervisors and business educators located throughout the United States. The participants responded to a questionnaire which contained a five-point scale: (1) Unimportant, (2) Of Some Importance, (3) Important, (4) Very Important, and (5) Extremely Important. A total of 16 word processing supervisors and 15 business educators returned questionnaires to the investigator, a 62 percent return.

This chapter will be presented in three sections. The first section includes the analysis related to personnel-oriented competencies of word processing employees. Section II presents the analysis related to equipment-oriented competencies of word processing employees. The final section describes those responses regarding procedures-oriented competencies of word processing employees.

The tables show data collected from 15 word processing supervisors and 16 business educators. The Chi-Square test was used to determine whether a significant difference at the .05 level existed between the responses of the two groups in the three areas of word processing being examined.

I. PERSONNEL-ORIENTED COMPETENCIES

Table I includes personnel-oriented competencies of prospective word processing employees. Responses of the 15 supervisors and 16

Table I. Personnel-Oriented Competencies of WP Employees as Perceived by Supervisors and Educators

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31a	Response in Percentages* Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	Chi-Square
1. Explains formal network patterns as defined by organization structure, i.e. line, line and staff	Supervisors	60.0	26.7	6.7	6.7	0.0	
	Educators	18.8	37.5	13.3	12.5	0.0	5.5569
2. Explains informal organization patterns and their impact on decision-making by personnel	Supervisors	53.3	20.0	20.0	6.7	0.0	
	Educators	6.3	50.0	31.3	12.5	0.0	8.3331*
3. Describes the traditional role of a multifunctional secretary	Supervisors	33.3	33.3	26.7	0.0	6.7	
	Educators	12.5	31.3	37.5	12.5	6.3	2.4560
4. Demonstrates understanding of word processing terminology	Supervisors	0.0	13.3	26.7	40.0	20.0	
	Educators	0.0	0.0	12.5	43.8	43.8	1.7903
5. Discusses the word processing supervisor's role and responsibilities, i.e. span of control, leadership	Supervisors	6.7	26.7	26.7	26.7	13.3	
	Educators	0.0	18.8	18.8	43.8	18.8	2.2558

Table I (Continued)

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Percentages* Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	Chi-Square
6. Displays ability to communicate effectively with other personnel	Supervisors	0.0	0.0	6.7	53.3	40.0	
	Educators	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0011[b]
7. Demonstrates ability to analyze and prioritize in-basket materials	Supervisors	0.0	6.7	26.7	26.7	40.0	
	Educators	0.0	0.0	18.8	50.0	31.3	0.2669
8. Explains the responsibilities of a word originator	Supervisors	13.3	33.3	40.0	13.3	0.0	
	Educators	0.0	6.3	37.5	37.5	18.8	7.3188*
9. Gives examples of sources used to identify prospective word processing personnel	Supervisors	33.3	26.7	33.3	6.7	0.0	
	Educators	0.0	31.3	50.0	18.8	0.0	6.7020*
10. Explains factors affecting salary administration of word processing personnel, i.e. quality of output, volume of work, difficulty of work	Supervisors	6.7	26.7	20.0	26.7	20.0	
	Educators	6.3	6.3	25.0	56.3	6.3	0.8314

Table I (Continued)

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Percentages* Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	Chi-Square
11. Gives examples of methods and techniques used for orienting/ training word processing personnel	Supervisors	0.0	33.3	40.0	13.3	13.3	
	Educators	6.3	18.8	50.0	18.8	6.3	0.9688
12. Describes responsibilities of correspondence secretaries, i.e. typing, proofreading, taking dictation, transcribing	Supervisors	0.0	26.7	26.7	26.7	20.0	
	Educators	0.0	6.3	12.5	50.0	31.3	2.6751
13. Demonstrates skills necessary for efficient performance in correspondence function, i.e., spelling, punctuation, vocabulary	Supervisors	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	
	Educators	0.0	0.0	6.3	18.8	75.0	0.0011[b]
14. Outlines promotional levels defined in the correspondence function, i.e. Junior correspondence Secretary, Proofreader, Supervisor	Supervisors	26.7	26.7	20.0	20.0	6.7	
	Educators	0.0	25.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	5.2890

Table I (Continued)

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Percentages* Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	Chi-Square
15. Describes responsibilities of administrative support secretaries, i.e. telephoning, filing, researching	Supervisors	40.0	40.0	13.3	0.0	6.7	
	Educators	6.3	0.0	37.5	37.5	18.8	10.2355*
16. Demonstrates skills necessary for efficient performance in administrative support function, i.e. flexibility, tactfulness, resourcefulness	Supervisors	0.0	13.3	20.0	13.3	53.3	
	Educators	0.0	0.0	18.8	43.8	37.5	0.2669
17. Explains promotional levels outlined in the administrative support function, i.e. Clerk, Senior Administrative Secretary, Supervisor, Manager	Supervisors	40.0	26.7	13.3	13.3	6.7	
	Educators	0.0	25.0	56.3	12.5	6.3	8.5556*
18. Discusses problems encountered during conversion to a word processing system	Supervisors	6.7	46.7	6.7	13.3	26.7	
	Educators	0.0	18.8	31.3	37.5	12.5	1.2548

Table I (Continued)

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Precentages* Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	Chi-Square
19. Gives examples of methods and techniques for promoting job satisfaction among correspondence and administrative support	Supervisors	6.7	6.7	40.0	26.7	20.0	
	Educators	0.0	18.8	37.5	31.3	12.5	1.2190
20. Identifies sources used to promote professionalism, i.e. organizations, publications	Supervisors	26.7	26.7	33.3	6.7	6.7	
	Educators	0.0	18.8	31.3	43.8	6.3	7.6345*
21. Discusses occupational outlook for word processing systems	Supervisors	20.0	26.7	33.3	6.7	13.3	
	Educators	6.3	18.8	43.8	31.3	0.0	1.5220

*Significant at the .05 level with two degrees of freedom. (Chi-Square = 5.991)

[a]15 respondents were Word Processing Supervisors; 16 respondents were Business Educators.

[b]To be interpreted with caution since zeroes still appeared in the table after collapsing the cells.

Educators are reported in percentages in the table as well as Chi-Square calculations. Table I contains 21 competency variables. Findings related to those 21 variables are described in this section.

1. *Explains formal network patterns as defined by organization structure.* The data reveal that one supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "very important," and five supervisors, 33.4 percent, rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance." Nine supervisors, 60 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Two educators, 12.5 percent, perceived the competency to be "very important," while 11 educators, 68.8 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." Three educators, 18.8 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 1.

2. *Explains informal organization patterns and their impact on decision-making by personnel.* One supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "very important," and six supervisors, 40 percent, rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance." Eight supervisors, 53.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Two educators, 12.5 percent, perceived the competency to be "very important," while 13 educators, 81.3 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 2.

3. *Describes the traditional role of a multifunctional secretary.* One supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." Nine supervisors, 60 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance." Five supervisors, 33.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "unimportant."

Three educators, 18.8 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Eleven educators, 68.8 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." Two educators, 12.5 percent, rated the competency as "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 3.

4. *Demonstrates understanding of word processing terminology.* The data reveal that nine supervisors, 60 percent indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." Six supervisors, 40 percent, rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance."

Fourteen educators, 87.6 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Two educators, 12.5 percent, perceived the competency as "important."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 4.

5. *Discusses the word processing supervisor's role and responsibilities.* The table shows that six supervisors, 40 percent indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." Eight supervisors, 53.4 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance." One supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "unimportant."

Ten educators 62.6 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Six educators, 37.6 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 5.

6. *Displays ability to communicate effectively with other personnel.* The survey showed that 14 supervisors, 93.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." One supervisor rated the competency "important."

All 16 educators perceived the competency "extremely important" or "very important."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 6.

7. *Demonstrates ability to analyze, synthesize, and prioritize in-basket materials.* Ten supervisors, 66.7 percent indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." Five

supervisors, 33.4 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "important" or "of some importance."

Thirteen educators, 81.3 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Three educators rated the competency "important."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 7.

8. Explains the responsibilities of a word originator. The data reveal that two supervisors, 13.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "very important." Eleven supervisors, 73.3 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance." Two supervisors 13.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Seven educators rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 8.

9. Gives examples of sources used to identify prospective word processing personnel. One supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is "very important." Nine supervisors, 60 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "important" or "of some importance." Five supervisors rated the competency "unimportant."

Three educators, 18.8 percent, perceived the competency as "very important." Thirteen educators, 81.3 percent perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 9.

10. Explains factors affecting salary administration of word processing personnel. The data show that seven supervisors, 46.7 percent indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." Seven supervisors, 46.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "important" or "of some importance." One supervisor rated the competency as "unimportant."

Ten educators, 62.6 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Five educators, 31.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 10.

11. Gives examples of methods and techniques used for orienting/ training word processing personnel. Four supervisors, 26.6 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eleven supervisors, 73.3 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

Four educators, 25.1 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eleven educators, 68.8 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 11.

12. Describes responsibilities of correspondence secretaries. The data reveal that seven supervisors, 46.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight supervisors, 53.4 percent, rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance."

Thirteen educators, 81.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Three educators, 18.8 percent rated the competency "important" or "of some importance.

The Chi Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 12.

13. Demonstrates skills necessary for efficient performance in correspondence function. All of the 15 supervisors indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important."

Fifteen educators, 93.8 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." One educator rated the competency "important."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 13.

14. Outlines promotional levels defined in the correspondence function. The survey showed that four supervisors, 26.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." Seven supervisors, 46.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "important" or "of some importance." Four supervisors rated the competency "unimportant."

Four educators, 25 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Twelve educators, 75 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significance difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 14.

15. Describes responsibilities of administrative support secretaries. One supervisor, 6.7 percent, considered the competency to be "extremely important." Eight supervisors, 53.3 percent, considered the competency as "important" or "of some imporatnce." Six supervisors, 40 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Six educators, 37.5 percent, perceived the competency as "important." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 15.

16. Demonstrates skills necessary for effective performance in administrative support function. Two thirds of the 15 supervisors, 66.6 percent, considered the competency to be "extremely important" or very important." Five supervisors, 33.3 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

Thirteen educators, 81.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Three educators, 18.8 percent, rated the competency "important."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 16.

17. Explains promotional levels outlined in the administrative support function. Three of the 15 supervisors, 20 percent, considered the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Six supervisors, 40 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance." Six supervisors, 40 percent, considered the competency to be "unimportant."

Three educators, 18.8 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Thirteen educators, 81.3 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 17.

18. Discusses problems encountered during conversion to a word processing system. The data reveal that six supervisors, 40 percent, considered the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight supervisors, 53.4 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance." One supervisor rated the competency "unimportant."

Eight educators, 50 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight educators, 50 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 18.

19. Gives examples of methods and techniques for promoting job satisfaction among correspondence and administrative support. The data reveal that seven supervisors, 46.7 percent, considered the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Seven supervisors, 46.7 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Seven educators, 43.8 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Nine educators, 56.3 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 19.

20. Identified sources used to promote professionalism. The data reveal that two supervisors, 13.4 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." Nine supervisors

60 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "important" or "of some importance." Four supervisors, 26.7 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Eight educators, 50.1 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight educators, 50.1 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 20.

21. Discusses occupational outlook for word processing systems. The data reveal that three supervisors, 20 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." Nine supervisors, 60 percent, considered the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." Three supervisors, 20 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Five educators, 31.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "very important." Ten educators, 62.6 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant.'

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 21.

II. EQUIPMENT-ORIENTED COMPETENCIES

Table II includes equipment-oriented competencies of prospective word processing employees. Supervisor and Educator responses in

Table II. Equipment-Oriented Competencies of WP Employees as Perceived by Supervisors and Educators

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Percentages* Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	Chi-Square
22. Discusses significance of historical developments, i.e. invention of typewriter, computer	Supervisors	60.0	33.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	5.9740[b]
	Educators	18.8	56.3	18.8	6.3	0.0	
23. Describes variety of input/ output equipment, i.e. dictating, transcribing, shared logic	Supervisors	6.7	20.0	46.7	13.3	13.3	1.3692
	Educators	0.0	12.5	50.0	18.8	18.8	
24. Outlines criteria for selecting appropriate input/ output equipment	Supervisors	20.0	33.3	26.7	0.0	20.0	5.3048
	Educators	0.0	6.3	43.8	18.8	31.3	
25. Demonstrates operational proficiency of input/output equipment	Supervisors	0.0	6.7	6.7	20.0	66.7	0.1346
	Educators	0.0	12.5	12.5	43.8	31.3	
26. Describes intraorganizational communications methods and devices, i.e. memorandums, telephone services, conveyor systems, closed-circuit television	Supervisors	26.7	46.7	13.3	13.3	0.0	6.7526*
	Educators	0.0	43.8	12.5	31.3	12.5	

Table II (Continued)

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Percentages* Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Importnat	Extremely Important	Chi-Square
27. Describes extraorganizational communications methods and devices, i.e. letters, telegraph, telephone	Supervisors	33.3	46.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	8.5767*
	Educators	0.0	31.3	18.8	43.8	6.3	
28. Justifies use of criteria in selecting reprographic methods and equipment	Supervisors	66.7	20.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	12.0059*[b]
	Educators	12.5	25.0	25.0	31.3	6.3	
29. Describes variety of reprographic methods and equipment	Supervisors	60.0	26.7	6.7	6.7	0.0	8.2404*
	Educators	12.5	31.3	25.0	25.0	6.3	
30. Demonstrates operational proficiency of reprographic equipment	Supervisors	73.3	20.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	12.7832*[b]
	Educators	12.5	37.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	
31. Describes variety of filing/ storage equipment, i.e. vertical, lateral, power	Supervisors	46.7	46.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	8.9507*[b]
	Educators	6.3	18.8	50.0	18.8	6.3	

Table II (Continued)

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a] =	Response in Percentages*					Chi-Square
		Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	
32. Identifies criteria for selecting appropriate filing/storage equipment	Supervisors	40.0	46.7	6.7	6.7	0.0	
	Educators	6.3	25.0	56.3	6.3	6.3	5.0683
33. Compares use of contemporary type of microforms, i.e. roll film, film strips, microfiche	Supervisors	80.0	13.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	
	Educators	12.5	31.3	50.0	0.0	6.3	15.1931*

*Significant at the .05 level with two degrees of freedom. (Chi-Square = 5.991)

[a]15 respondents were Word Processing Supervisors; 16 respondents were Business Educators.

[b]To be interpreted with caution since zeroes still appeared in the table after collapsing the cells.

percentages are reported in the table as well as Chi-Square calculations. Table II contains the data on 12 competency variables. The table shows the analysis of data which is discussed in this section.

22. *Discusses significance of historical developments.* The data reveal that six supervisors, 40 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "important" or "of some importance." Nine supervisors, 60 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

One educator, 6.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "very important." Twelve educators, 75.1 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." Three educators, 18.8 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 22.

23. *Describes variety of input/output equipment.* The data reveal that four supervisors, 26.6 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "extremely important" or "very important." Ten supervisors, 66.7 percent, rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance." One supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "unimportant."

Six educators, 37.6 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Ten educators, 62.5 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significance difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 23.

24. Outlines criteria for selecting appropriate input/output equipment. The data reveal that three supervisors, 20 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important." Nine supervisors, 60 percent, indicated that the competency is considered as "important" or "of some importance." Three supervisors, 20 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Eight educators, 50.1 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight educators, 50.1 percent, rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 24.

25. Demonstrates operational proficiency of input/output equipment. The data reveal that 13 supervisors, 86.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Two supervisors, 13.4 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

Twelve educators, 75.1 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Four educators, 25 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 25.

26. Describes intraorganizational communications methods and devices. The data reveal that two supervisors, 13.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "very important." Nine supervisors, 60 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" or "of some importance." Four supervisors, 26.7 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Seven educators, 43.8 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Nine educators, 56.3 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 26.

27. Describes extraorganizational communications methods and devices. The data reveal that two supervisors, 13.4 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight supervisors, 53.4 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" or "of some importance." Five supervisors, 33.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Eight educators, 50.1 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight educators, 50.1 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 27.

28. Justifies use of criteria in selecting reprographic methods and equipment. The data reveal that five supervisors, 33.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" or "of some importance." Ten supervisors, 66.7 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Six educators, 37.6 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight educators, 50 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." Two educators, 12.5 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 28.

29. Describes variety of reprographic methods and equipment. The data reveal that one supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "very important." Five supervisors, 33.4 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" or "of some importance." Nine supervisors, 60 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Five educators, 31.3 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." Two educators, 12.5 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 29.

30. Demonstrates operational proficiency of reprographic equipment. The data reveal that four supervisors, 26.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" or "of some importance." Eleven supervisors, 73.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Four educators, 25 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Ten educators, 62.5 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." Two educators, 12.5 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 30.

31. Describes variety of filing/storage equipment. The data reveal that eight supervisors, 53.4 percent, indicated that the competency is considered as "important" or "of some importance." Seven supervisors, 46.7 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Four educators, 25.1 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Eleven educators, 68.8 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." One educator rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 31.

32. Identifies criteria for selecting appropriate filing/storage equipment. The data reveal that one supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "very important." Eight supervisors, 53.4 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "important" or

"of some importance." Six supervisors, 40 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Two educators, 12.6 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Thirteen educators, 62.6 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 32.

33. Compares use of contemporary types of microforms. The data reveal that one supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "very important." Two supervisors, 13.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "of some importance." Twelve supervisors, 80 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

One educator, 6.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important." Thirteen educators, 81.3 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." Two educators, 12.5 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 33.

III. PROCEDURES-ORIENTED COMPETENCIES

Table III includes procedures-oriented competencies of prospective word processing employees. Supervisor and Educator responses in percentages

Table III. Procedures-Oriented Competencies of WP Employees as Perceived by Supervisors and Educators

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Percentages*					Chi-Square
		Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	
34. Explains purpose of word processing, i.e. cost factor, time factor, productivity, quality	Supervisors	0.0	13.3	26.7	26.7	33.3	
	Educators	0.0	18.8	25.0	37.5	18.8	0.0233
35. Discusses methods of origination, i.e. longhand, shorthand, machine dictation	Supervisors	0.0	6.7	40.0	20.0	33.3	
	Educators	6.3	6.3	50.0	31.3	6.3	1.5050
36. Summarizes the purpose of conducting a feasibility study	Supervisors	13.3	40.0	13.3	20.0	13.3	
	Educators	0.0	31.3	43.8	18.8	6.3	2.8819
37. Gives examples of methods and techniques available for conducting a feasibility study	Supervisors	26.7	20.0	26.7	6.7	20.0	
	Educators	6.3	25.0	37.5	18.8	12.5	2.4108
38. Compares centralization vs. decentralization as it pertains to word processing	Supervisors	20.0	13.3	33.3	20.0	13.3	
	Educators	6.3	12.5	43.8	25.0	12.5	1.3100

Table III (Continued)

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Percentages* Unimportant	Of some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	Chi-Square
39. Interprets organization charts	Supervisors	20.0	53.3	26.7	0.0	0.0	
	Educators	12.5	18.8	56.3	12.5	0.0	2.1700[b]
40. Demonstrates understanding of efficient "flow of work" as it pertains to word processing	Supervisors	0.0	6.7	6.7	40.0	46.7	
	Educators	0.0	6.3	37.5	31.3	25.0	2.1569
41. Identifies methods useful in improving dictation/transcription cycle, i.e. feedback via conferences, evaluation	Supervisors	6.7	20.0	33.3	20.0	20.0	
	Educators	0.0	18.8	18.8	43.8	18.8	2.2558
42. Describes alternative solutions for alleviating conversion problems	Supervisors	20.0	20.0	53.3	0.0	6.7	
	Educators	12.5	25.0	25.0	31.3	6.3	4.2172
43. Explains types of office design, i.e. conventional, landscaping, movable partitions	Supervisors	46.7	33.3	13.3	6.7	0.0	
	Educators	6.3	50.0	37.5	6.3	0.0	6.8082*

Table III (Continued)

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Percentages* Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	Chi-Square
44. Outlines space requirements for furniture, equipment, personnel	Supervisors	33.3	46.7	13.3	6.7	0.0	
	Educators	12.5	50.0	31.3	6.3	0.0	1.9828
45. Discusses office environmental factors, i.e. lighting, noise, color	Supervisors	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	
	Educators	12.5	37.5	37.5	12.5	0.0	3.4389[b]
46. Summarizes current and anticipated demand of word processing technological developments and procedures	Supervisors	13.3	20.0	26.7	20.0	20.0	
	Educators	18.8	0.0	43.8	31.3	6.3	0.1679
47. Explains the records management concept	Supervisors	40.0	33.3	13.3	6.7	6.7	
	Educators	6.3	12.5	50.0	25.0	6.3	5.3599
48. Demonstrates ability to analyze various types of documents to determine best procedures for handling output	Supervisors	6.7	0.0	20.0	13.3	60.0	
	Educators	6.3	0.0	37.5	25.0	31.3	1.1690

Table III (Continued)

Competency Variable	Respondents N=31[a]	Response in Percentages*					Chi-Square
		Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	
49. Identifies methods for measuring employee performance	Supervisors	0.0	20.0	33.3	20.0	26.7	
	Educators	6.3	12.5	25.0	37.5	18.8	1.5050
50. Compares use of various types of business forms for their cost-cutting potential	Supervisors	26.7	20.0	40.0	6.7	6.7	
	Educators	6.3	25.0	31.3	25.0	12.5	3.7717

*Significant at the .05 level with two degrees of freedom. (Chi-Square = 5.991)

[a]15 respondents were Word Processing Supervisors; 16 respondents were Business Educators.

[b]To be interpreted with caution since zeroes still appeared in the table after collapsing the cells.

are reported in the table as well as Chi-Square calculations. Table III contains 17 competency variables. The findings related to those variables are discussed in this section.

34. Explains purpose of word processing. The data reveal that nine supervisors, 60 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Five supervisors, 40 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Seven educators, 43.8 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 34.

35. Discusses methods of origination. The data reveal that eight supervisors, 53.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Seven supervisors rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance."

Six educators, 37.6 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 35.

36. Summarizes the purpose of conducting a feasibility study. The data reveal that five supervisors, 33.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight supervisors, 53.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "important" or "of some importance." Two of the supervisors, 13.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Four educators, 25.1 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Twelve educators, 75.1 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 36.

37. Gives examples of methods and techniques available for conducting a feasibility study. The data reveal that four supervisors, 26.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Seven supervisors, 46.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "important" or "of some importance." Four supervisors, 26.7 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Five educators, 31.3 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Ten educators, 62.5 percent, perceived the competency as "important' or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 37.

38. Compares centralization vs. decentralization as it pertains to word processing. The data reveal that five supervisors, 33.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Seven supervisors, 46.6 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" or "of some importance." Three supervisors, 20 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Six educators, 37.5 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 38.

39. Interprets organization charts. The data reveal that four supervisors, 26.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" while eight supervisors, 53.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered "of some importance." Three supervisors, 20 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Two educators, 12.5 percent, perceived the competency to be "very important." Twelve educators, 75.1 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." Two educators, 12.5 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 39.

40. Demonstrates understanding of efficient "flow of work" as it pertains to word processing. The data reveal that 13 supervisors, 86.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Two supervisors, 13.4 percent rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance."

Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Seven educators, 43.8 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 40.

41. Identifies methods useful in improving dictation/transcription cycle. The data reveal that six supervisors, 40 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight supervisors, 53.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered as "important" or "of some importance." One supervisor, 6.7 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Ten educators, 62.6 percent, perceived the competency to be "extremely important" or "very important." Six educators, 37.6 percent, rated the competency "important" or "of some importance."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 41.

42. Describes alternative solutions for alleviating conversion problems. The data reveal that one supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important." Eleven supervisors, 73.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered as "important" or "of some importance." Three supervisors, 20 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Six educators, 37.6 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Eight educators 50 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." Two educators, 12.5 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 42.

43. Explains types of office design. The data reveal that one supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "very important." Seven supervisors, 46.6 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" or "of some importance." Seven supervisors, 46.7 percent rated the competency "unimportant."

One educator, 6.3 percent, perceived the competency as "very important." Fourteen educators, 87.5 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed a significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 43.

44. Outlines space requirements for furniture, equipment, personnel. The data reveal that one supervisor, 6.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "very important." Nine supervisors, 60 percent, indicated that the competency is considered as "important" of "of some importance." Five supervisors, 33.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

One educator, 6.3 percent, perceived the competency as "very important." Thirteen educators 81.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." Two educators, 12.5 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 44.

45. Discusses office environmental factors. The data reveal that 10 supervisors, 66.6 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" or "of some importance." Five supervisors, 33.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Two educators, 12.5 percent, perceived the competency as "very important." Twelve educators, 75 percent, perceived the competency as "important" or "of some importance." Two educators, 12.5 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 45.

46. Summarizes current and anticipated demand of word processing technological developments and procedures. The data reveal that six supervisors, 40 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Seven supervisors, 46.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered as "important" of "of some importance." Two supervisors, 13.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Six educators, 37.6 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Seven educators, 43.8 percent, perceived the competency to be "important." Three educators, 18.8 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 46.

47. Explains the records management concept. The data reveal that two supervisors, 13.4 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Seven supervisors, 46.6 percent, indicated that the competency is considered as "important" or "of some importance." Six supervisors, 40 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

Five educators, 31.3 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Ten educators, 62.5 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 47.

48. Demonstrates ability to analyze various types of documents to determine best procedures for handling output. The data reveal that 11 supervisors, 73.3 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Three supervisors, 20 percent, indicated that the competency is considered as "important." One supervisor, 6.7 percent rated the competency "unimportant."

Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Six educators, 37.5 percent, perceived the competency to be "important." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 48.

49. Identifies methods for measuring employee performance. The data reveal that seven supervisors, 46.7 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." Eight supervisors, 53.3 percent, rated the competency as "important" or "of some importance."

Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Six educators, 37.5 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 49.

50. Compares use of various types of business forms for their cost-cutting potential. The data reveal that two supervisors, 13.4 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "extremely important" or "very important." None supervisors, 60 percent, indicated that the competency is considered to be "important" or "of some importance." Four supervisors, 26.7 percent, rated the competency "unimportant.

Six educators, 37.5 percent, perceived the competency as "extremely important" or "very important." Nine educators, 56.3 percent, perceived the competency to be "important" or "of some importance." One educator, 6.3 percent, rated the competency "unimportant."

The Chi-Square test showed *no* significant difference in the perceptions of the supervisors and educators regarding competency variable number 50.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings, conclusions, and recommendations resulting from the survey of word processing supervisors and business educators concerning their perceptions of competencies needed by prospective word processing employees.

The problem of this study was to determine competencies which should be taught to prospective word processing employees. In order to delineate these competencies, it was necessary to answer the following questions:

1. What competencies are identified in three of the most recently published word processing textbooks which are being used for collegiate-level instruction?

2. What competencies are perceived as important by business educators and word processing supervisors who are currently teaching/supervising in the area of word processing?

3. Do business word processing supervisors agree with the business educators as to the importance of the perceived competencies?

Questionnaires were distributed to 25 word processing supervisors and 25 business educators located throughout the United States. A follow-up letter was sent to 24 supervisors/educators who had not returned the questionnaire. Fifteen supervisors and 16 educators returned the questionnaire. The Chi-Square test at the .05 level of confidence was used to determine whether a significant difference existed between the perceptions of the word processing supervisors and the business educators.

I. FINDINGS

The first section of this chapter reflects the opinions of 15 word processing supervisors and 16 business educators about the importance of "personnel-oriented" competencies of prospective word processing employees; the second section describes their perceptions of the importance of "equipment-oriented" competencies needed by prospective employees; and the third section discusses their perceptions of "procedures-oriented" competencies needed by prospective word processing employees.

Personnel-Oriented Competencies

1. The competencies that were considered "extremely important," "very important," or "important" by a majority of the word processing supervisors and business educators were as follows:

A. Demonstrates understanding of word processing terminology;

B. Discusses the word processing supervisor's role and responsibilities;

C. Displays ability to communicate effectively with other personnel;

D. Demonstrates ability to analyze, synthesize, and prioritize in basket materials;

E. Explains the responsibilities of a word originator;

F. Explains factors affecting salary administration of word processing personnel;

G. Gives examples of methods and techniques used for orienting/training word processing personnel;

H. Describes responsibilities of correspondnece secretaries;

I. Demonstrates skills necessary for efficient performance in correspondence function;

J. Demonstrates skills necessary for efficient performance in administrative support function;

K. Gives examples of methods and techniques for promoting job satisfaction among correspondence and administrative support; and

L. Discusses occupational outlook for word processing systems.

2. The competencies that were perceived to have a significant difference in importance were as follows:

A. Explains informal organization patterns and their impact on decision-making by personnel;

B. Explains the responsibilities of a word originator;

C. Gives examples of sources used to identify prospective word processing personnel;

D. Describes responsibilities of administrative support secretaries;

E. Explains promotional levels outlined in the administrative support function; and

F. Identifies sources used to promote professionalism.

Equipment-Oriented Competencies

3. The competencies that were considered "extremely important," "very important," or "important" by a majority of the word processing supervisors and business educators were as follows:

A. Describes variety of input/output equipment, and

B. Demonstrates operational proficiency of input/output equipment.

4. The competencies that were perceived to have a significant difference in importance were as follows:

A. Describes intraorganizational communications methods and devices;

B. Describes extraorganizational communications methods and devices;

C. Justifies use of criteria in selecting reprographic methods and equipment;

D. Describes variety of reprographic methods and equipment;

E. Demonstrates operational proficiency of reprographic equipment;

F. Describes variety of filing/storage equipment; and

G. Compares use of contemporary types of microforms.

Procedures-Oriented Competencies

5. The competencies that were considered "extremely important," "very important," or "important" by a majority of the word processing supervisors and business educators were as follows:

A. Explains purpose of word processing;

B. Discusses methods of origination;

C. Gives examples of methods and techniques available for conducting a feasibility study;

D. Compares centralization vs. decentralization as it pertains to word processsing;

E. Demonstrates understanding of efficient "flow of work" as it pertains to word processing;

F. Identifies methods useful in improving dictation/transcription cycle;

G. Describes alternative solutions for alleviating conversion problems;

H. Summarizes current and anticipated demand of word processing technological developments and procedures;

I. Explains the records management concept;

J. Demonstrates ability to analyze various types of documents to determine best procedures for handling output;

K. Identifies methods for measuring employee performance; and

L. Compares various types of business forms for their cost-cutting potential.

6. The competency that was perceived to have a significant difference in importance was competency 43:

A. Explains types of office design.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were made from the findings of this study:

1. Prospective word processing employees should develop people-oriented competencies as they relate to word processing terminology; responsibilities of word processing supervisors; effective communication methods; analysis, synthesis, and prioritization of in-basket materials; responsibilities of word originators; salary administration of word processing personnel; methods for orienting/training word processing personnel; efficiency in performance of correspondence function; efficiency in performance of administrative support function; methods for promoting job satisfaction; and occupational outlook for word processing systems.

2. Prospective word processing employees should develop equipment-oriented competencies as they relate to the identification and proficient operation of input/output equipment.

3. Prospective word processing employees should develop procedures-oriented competencies as they relate to the purpose of word processing; methods of origination; methods for conducting feasibility studies; centralization and decentralization of word processing systems; efficiency in "flow of work;" methods for improving dictation/transcription cycles; alternative solutions for alleviating conversion problems; current and anticipated demand for word processing technological developments and procedures; records management concept; analysis of various types of documents to enhance output methods; methods for measuring employee performance; and analysis of various types of business forms for their cost-cutting potential.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of this research, the following recommendations are made for further study:

1. Similar studies should be conducted in local areas to determine if word processing competencies expected by business people are being achieved through existing curricula.

2. Follow-up studies of business education/secretarial graduates who have received word processing instruction should be conducted to determine whether initial programs have supplied the students with relevant knowledges/skills/attitudes to function efficiently in a word processing environment.

3. A similiar study using a larger sample could be used to determine changes in perceptions as the word processing concept grows and becomes more widely accepted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beller, Alexander S. "Much More Than Hardware," *Office System 6 Management Seminar,* International Business Machines Corporation, 1977.

Bely, Jeanette L. "Word Processing and Its Implications on Stenography," *The Balance Sheet,* 54:6 (April 1973).

Briggaman, Joan S. "Promises, Promises," *Journal of Business Education,* 51:2 (February 1976).

Burns, Christopher. "The Evolution of Office Information Systems," *Datamation* (April 1977).

Carson, John H. "Your Secretary: Robot or Management Aide?" *Industry Week,* 174:3 (July 17, 1972).

Cecil, Paula B. "The Evolution of California's New Education Baby: Word Processing," *California Business Education Journal,* 12:7 (May 1977).

Crenshaw, Doris C. "Word Processing Can be a Secretary's Best Friend," *The Secretary,* 34:9 (November 1974).

Dillion, Margaret H. "End or Beginning?" *Office System 6 Management Seminar,* International Business Machines Corporation, 1977.

Eichhorn, Richard E. "A Vendor Doesn't Walk on Water," *Words,* 6:4 (Winter, 1977-78).

Frame, Terry M. "Word Processing Is No Myth," *American Vocational Journal,* 50:9 (December 1975).

Greenblatt, Robert. Forecast for DP/WP Integration," *Word Processing,* 5:5 (September/October 1976).

Hebert, Margaret. "Analysis of Competencies Needed by Typewriting Teachers as Perceived by Business Teachers and by Authorities in Business Education," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Houston, 1973.

Henry, Anne K., and Wells, Patricia A. A Practicum in Word Processing Systems," *Journal of Business Education,* 50:2 (November 1974).

Hulbert, Jack E. "Preparing Students for Word Processing Careers," *Journal of Business Education,* 52:4 (January 1977).

Johnson, Arlene. "Word Processing--Your Curriculum Is Showing!" *Business Education Forum,* (March 1976).

Kennedy, Vivian N. "Word Processing: Is It Worth Investigating for Your School's Curriculum?" *California Business Education Journal*, 9:3 (May 1974).

Kidwell, Richard. "The Dilemma of Word Processing," *Balance Sheet*, 59:3 (November 1977).

Kleinschrod, Walter A. *Management's Guide to Word Processing*, Chicago, Illinois: Dartnell Press, 1975.

Konkel, Gilbert J. and Peck, Phyllis J. *The Word Processing Explosion*, Stamford, Connecticut: Office Publications, Inc., 1976.

Long, R. Charles. "The Impact of Word Processing on Business Education," *American Vocational Journal*, 49:59 (February 1974).

Moody, Patricia G., and Matthews, Anne Lamb. "Word Processing: More a Matter of Skills Than Equipment," *Balance Sheet*, 69:5 (February 1978).

Morrison, James L. "A Human Trade-Off for Word Processing Specialists," *Balance Sheet*, 55:5 (February 1974).

Nance, Harold W. "Is Word Processing a Substitute for a Poor Typist," *The Secretary*, 34:3 (March 1974).

Ober, B. Scot. "What Business Educators Should Know About Word Processing," *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal* (August 1972).

Penzer, William N. "The Mechanization of Emily," *Administrative Management*, 35:1 (January 1974).

Powell, Merton E. "The Modern Automated Word Processing System--Its Implications for Changes in the Curriculum for Business and Office Education," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Montana, 1975.

Quible, Zane K. *Introduction to Administrative Office Management*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1977.

Reiff, Rosanne. "A New and Different Look at Word Processing," *Journal of Business Education*, 50:8 (May, 1975).

_____. "Entry-Level Job Qualifications and Employee Attitudes in New York City Word Processing Centers and Implications for Secondary School Business Education Curricula in the New York Metropolitan Area," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, 1974).

Rosen, Arnold. "Models for Word Processing Curricula," *Words*, 6:4 (Winter, 1977-78).

Saliba, Amy. "Word Processing--Status of Equipment and Role Expectations of Employees in Dothan, Alabama, Business Firms," unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1978.

Smiley, James M. "The Identification and Comparison of Accounting Concepts That Should be and are Included in the Course Content of the First-Year High School and Post-Secondary Accounting Courses," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1972.

"Successfully Planning the Human Side of Word Processing," *Office System 6 Management Seminar*, International Business Machines Corporation, 1977.

Tepper, Harold. "The Private Secretary: A Company Liability," *Management Review*, 62:2 (February 1973).

"The Office of the Future," *Business Week*, (June 1975).

Wohl, Amy D. "What's Happening in Word Processing?" *Datamation* (April 1977).

Young, Penny. "Career Path Questions--No Standard Answers," *Word Processing*, 6:2 (March/April, 1977).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMPETENCY SOURCES

SUPERVISORS/EDUCATORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

COMPETENCY SOURCES

Cecil, Paula B. *Word Processing in the Modern Office*. Menlo Park, California: Cummings Publishing Company, Inc., 1976.

McCabe, Helen M., and Popham, Estelle L. *Word Processing: A Systems Approach to the Office*. New York, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1977.

Rosen, Arnold, and Fielden, Rosemany. *Word Processing*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

No._____

COMPETENCIES OF WORD PROCESSING EMPLOYEES

To what extent do you feel that prospective employees should be able to demonstrate the following competencies as prerequisite knowledges/skills/attitudes for employment in a word processing center? A rating of "5" would mean that the competency is extremely important, and a rating of "1" would mean that the competency is *not* important. Please circle your choice.

	Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
1. Explains formal network patterns as defined by organization structure, i.e. line, line and staff	1	2	3	4	5
2. Explains informal organization patterns and their impact on decision-making by personnel	1	2	3	4	5
3. Describes the traditional role of a multifunctional secretary	1	2	3	4	5
4. Demonstrates understanding of word processing terminology	1	2	3	4	5
5. Discusses the word processing supervisor's role and responsibilities, i.e. span of control, leadership	1	2	3	4	5
6. Displays ability to communicate effectively with other personnel	1	2	3	4	5
7. Demonstrates ability to analyze, synthesize, and prioritize in-basket materials	1	2	3	4	5
8. Explains the responsibilities of a word originator	1	2	3	4	5
9. Gives examples of sources used to identify prospective word processing personnel	1	2	3	4	5
10. Explains factors affecting salary administration of word processing personnel, i.e. quality of output, volume of work, difficulty of work	1	2	3	4	5
11. Gives examples of methods and techniques used for orienting/training word processing personnel	1	2	3	4	5

		Unimportant		Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
12.	Describes responsibilities of correspondence secretaries, i.e. typing, proofreading taking dictation, transcribing	1		2	3	4	5
13.	Demonstrates skills necessary for efficient performance in correspondnece function, i.e. spelling, punctuation, vocabulary	1		2	3	4	5
14.	Outlines promotional levels defined in the correspondence function, i.e. Junior Correspondence Secretary, Proofreader, Supervisor	1		2	3	4	5
15.	Describes responsibilities of administrative support secretaries, i.e. telephoning, filing, researching	1		2	3	4	5
16.	Demonstrates skills necessary for efficient performance in administrative support function, i.e. flexibility, tactfulness, resourcefulness	1		2	3	4	5
17.	Explains promotional levels outlined in the administrative support function, i.e. Clerk, Senior Administrative Secretary, Supervisor, Manager	1		2	3	4	5
18.	Discusses problems encountered during conversion to a word processing system	1		2	3	4	5
19.	Gives examples of methods and techniques for promoting job satisfaction among correspondence and administrative support	1		2	3	4	5
20.	Identifies sources used to promote professionalism, i.e. organizations, publications	1		2	3	4	5
21.	Discusses occupational outlook for word processing systems	1		2	3	4	5
22.	Discusses significance of historical developments, i.e. invention of typewriter, computer	1		2	3	4	5
23.	Describes variety of input/output equipment, i.e. dictating, transcribing, shared logic	1		2	3	4	5
24.	Outlines criteria for selecting appropriate input/output equipment	1		2	3	4	5
25.	Demonstrates operational proficiency of input/output equipment	1		2	3	4	5

	Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
26. Describes intraorganizational communications methods and devices, i.e. memorandums, telephone services, conveyor systems, closed-circuit television	1	2	3	4	5
27. Describes extraorganizational communications methods and devices, i.e. letters, telegraph, telephone	1	2	3	4	5
28. Justifies use of criteria in selecting reprographic method and equipment	1	2	3	4	5
29. Describes variety of reprographic methods and equipment	1	2	3	4	5
30. Demonstrates operational proficiency of reprographic equipment	1	2	3	4	5
31. Describes variety of filing/storage equipment, i.e. vertical, lateral, power	1	2	3	4	5
32. Identifies criteria for selecting appropriate filing/storage equipment	1	2	3	4	5
33. Compares use of comtemporary types of microforms, i.e. roll film, film strips, microfiche	1	2	3	4	5
34. Explains purpose of word processing, i.e. cost factor, time factor, productivity, quality	1	2	3	4	5
35. Discusses methods of origination, i.e. longhand, shorthand, machine dictation	1	2	3	4	5
36 Summarizes the purpose of conducting a feasibility study	1	2	3	4	5
37. Gives examples of methods and techniques available for conducting a feasibility study	1	2	3	4	5
38. Compares centralization vs. decentralization as it pertains to word processing	1	2	3	4	5
39. Interprets organization charts	1	2	3	4	5
40. Demonstrates understanding of efficient "flow of work" as it pertains to word processing	1	2	3	4	5
41. Identifies methods useful in improving dictation/transcription cycle, i.e. feedback via conferences, evaluations	1	2	3	4	5
42. Describes alternative solutions for alleviating conversion problems	1	2	3	4	5

	Unimportant	Of Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
43. Explains types of office design, i.e. conventional, landscaping, movable partitions	1	2	3	4	5
44. Outlines space requirements for furniture, equipment, personnel	1	2	3	4	5
45. Discusses office environmental factors, i.e. lighting, noise, color	1	2	3	4	5
46. Summarizes current and anticipated demand of word processing technological developments and procedures	1	2	3	4	5
47. Explains the records management concept	1	2	3	4	5
48. Demonstrates ability of analyze various types of documents to determine best procedures for handling output	1	2	3	4	5
49. Identifies methods for measuring employee performance	1	2	3	4	5
50. Compares use of various types of business forms for their cost-cutting potential	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

LIST OF WORD PROCESSING SUPERVISORS AND BUSINESS EDUCATORS

WORD PROCESSING SUPERVISORS

1. Ms. Ardith Herrema*
The Upjohn Company
7000 Portage Road
Kalamazoo, MI 49001

2. Ms. Dottie Koegel*
Brown and Williamson Tobacco
1600 W. Hill Street
Louisville, KY 40323

3. Ms. Barbara Costa
Pharmacia, Inc.
800 Centennial Avenue
Piscataway, NJ 08854

4. Ms. Janice M. Bernard
Simpson Timber Co.
900 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98164

5. Ms. Janet Haibach*
Lord Corp.
1635 W. 12th Street
Erie, PA 16512

6. Ms. Carolyn S. Buchanan*
Caterpillar Tractor Co.
100 NE Adams Street
Peoria, IL 61629

7. Ms. Jennie Drabbant
Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co.
509 Marshall
Shreveport, LA 71151

8. Ms. Doris Crenshaw, CPS*
Texas Eastern Transmission
921 Main Street
Houston, TX 77001

---

*Returned the questionnaire for input in this study.

9. Ms. Agnes R. Frank*
Samsonite Corp.
11200 E. 45th Street
Denver, CO 80239

10. Ms. Donna Smith
Alcon Laboratories, Inc.
6201 S. Freeway
Fort Worth, TX 76101

11. Ms. Janet Kessler
General Foods Corp.
250 North Street
White Plains, NY 10625

12. Ms. Helen Murphy*
Portland General Electric Co.
121 SW Salmon Street
Portland, OR 97204

13. Ms. Marian O'Dell
Daniel International Corp.
310 N. Main Street
Greenville, SC 29602

14. Ms. Alice M. Price
Didde-Glaser, Inc.
1200 Graphic Arts Road
Emporia, KS 66801

15. Ms. Jane Charblin*
Herman Miller, Inc.
8500 Byron Road
Zeeland, MI 49464

16. Ms. Theresa Kalata*
Peavey Co.
730 Second Ave., S.
Minneapolis, MN 55402

17. Ms. Cheryl Richard
Mattel Toy Co.
5150 Rosecrans Ave.
Hawthorne, CA 90250

---

*Returned the questionnaire for input in this study.

18. Ms. Corrine Hagan*
Indiana National Bank
One Indiana Square
Indianapolis, IN 46266

19. Ms Audrey M. Stewart*
Pacific Lighting Corp.
810 S. Flower Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

20. Ms. Jaynie C. Shelton*
Southwest Gas Corp.
5241 Spring Mountain Road
Las Vegas, NV 89102

21. Ms. Melanie Terry*
Duke Power Co.
422-30 S. Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28242

22. Ms. Jennie Veazey
Fidelity Union Life Insurance
1511 Bryan Street
Dallas, TX 75221

23. Ms. Barbara Anazalone
Sambo's Restaurants, Inc.
3760 State Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

24. Ms. Nancy Abshure
First National Bank
5th and Broadway
Little Rock, AR 72203

25. Ms. C. Ruth Bond, CPS
Phillips Petroleum Co.
Keeler Ave. between 4th/5th
Bartlesville, OK 74003

---

*Returned the questionnaire for input in this study.

BUSINESS EDUCATORS

1. Dr. Richard Kidwell*
Department of Business Education
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85700

2. Dr. James L. Morrison*
College of Business and Economics
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19711

3. Ms. Arlene Johnson*
Secretarial Science Department
District One Technical Institute
Eau Claire, WI 54701

4. Dr. Patricia A. Wells*
Department of Business Education
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97330

5. Ms. Anne K. Henry
Department of Business Education
Virginia State College
Peterburg, VA 23803

6. Dr. Rita C. Kutie*
Secretarial Science Department
Lakeland Community College
Mentor, OH 44060

7. Dr. Rosanne Reiff
Department of Business Education
Hunter College
New York, NY 10000

8. Dr. Merton E. Powell*
Department of Adult and Occupational Education
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66502

9. Dr. Ruth I. Anderson
Department of Business Education
North Texas State University
Denton, TX 76201

---

*Returned the questionnaire for input in this study.

10. Dr. Susie Hess VanHuss
College of Business Administration
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29200

11. Dr. Gerald L. Hershey*
School of Business
University of North Carolina
Greensboro, NC 27400

12. Dr. Gary N. McLean*
270 Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

13. Ms. Carol Martin*
Chattanooga State Technical Community College
4501 Amnicola Highway
Chattanooga, TN 37406

14. Dr. Clyde Welter
Department of Business Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30300

15. Dr. Harriet McIntosh*
Department of Business Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30300

16. Dr. Jeanne L. Holley*
Box 24, Conner Hall
University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677

17. Dr. Kathleen P. Wagoner
Department of Business Education
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306

18. Ms. Rosemary Fielden
Secretarial Science Department
Nassau Community College
Garden City, NY 11530

---

*Returned the questionnaire for input in this study.

19. Mr. Arnold Rosen*
Secretarial Science Department
Nassau Community College
Garden, NY 11530

20. Ms. Paula B. Cecil*
Secretarial Science Department
West Valley College
Aptos, CA 95003

21. Ms. Helen M. McCabe
Secretarial Science Department
LaGuardia Community College
New York, NY 10000

22. Ms. Patricia G. Moody*
College of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

23. Mr. Jack Hulbert
College of Business
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19711

24. Ms. Katie Layman*
Department of Business Education
Evergreen Valley College
San Jose, CA 95100

25. Ms. Adrienne Renner*
Department of Business Education
Cabrillo College
Aptos, CA 95003

---

*Returned the questionnaire for input in this study.

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP LETTER

May 19, 1978

Dear

I am a graduate student at The University of Tennessee in Knoxville in the Vocational-Technical Education Department. My study entitled "Competencies of Word Processing Employees as Perceived by Educators and Supervisors," will be in partial fulfillment for the Master of Science Degree at The University of Tennessee. The enclosed instrument is composed of competencies identified by a review of three of the most recently published word processing textbooks.

I am submitting this instrument to a selected sample of word processing educators and supervisors throughout the United States. The responses of both groups will be analyzed and compared with the ultimate objective being the determination of valid competencies which should be included in word processing instruction at the collegiate level.

Your professional opinions, as reflected by the responses on the enclosed instrument, are vital to the completion of this study. The results of this project will help improve the education of office personnel here at The University of Tennessee and at other schools.

To complete the enclosed questionnaire, just indicate the importance which you feel should be placed on each competency in order to better prepare students for employment in word processing centers. There is no right or wrong answer. I am interested in your professional perceptions.

Your cooperation in this research endeavor will be very much appreciated. If you will return the competed data by June 2, a copy of the results of the study can be made available to you within the near future.

Very truly yours,

Sharon K. Allred

Enclosures

June 8, 1978

Dear

On May 19, I submitted to you a questionnaire concerning my thesis entitled, "Competencies of Word Processing Employees as Perceived by Educators and Supervisors." Your professional assistance is needed in order to produce a more meaningful project. Therefore, will you please complete and return the word processing questionnaire which you received at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sharon K. Allred
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Business Education.

VITA

Sharon Kaye Allred was born in Toledo, Ohio, on March 14, 1955. She attended elementary school in Ethridge and Lawrenceburg, Tennessee, and was graduated from Lawrence County High School in 1973. In 1977, she received a Bachelor of Science degree in Secretarial Education from The University of North Alabama in Florence.

She was awarded a graduate teaching assistantship at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in the summer of 1977. She received her Master of Science degree in Business Education in December 1978.

The author is a member of the National Business Education Association, Tennessee Business Education Association, and Delta Pi Epsilon. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James E. Allred of Lawrenceburg, Tennessee.