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## JOB CONTENT ANALYSIS OF APPAREL BUYER POSITIONS

 IN DEPARTMENT STORESSung Jee Chung. Texas Woman's University. Denton, Texas May 1993. Ph.D. in Clothing and Fashion Merchandising. Dr. Marian Jernigan, Major Professor.

The purpose of the study was to investigate the job content of apparel buyer positions in department stores and make comparisons of job elements according to store size as determined by annual sales volume. A modified Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) was used to determine job content in six major categories.

Questionnaires were distributed to 750 buyers of men's, women's or children's apparel in 42 department stores. A sample of 185 buyers responded to the questionnaire.

The most important/extensively used and the least important/extensively used job elements in each of the six PAQ divisions were determined by comparing mean scores. Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to determine differences in the importance/extent of use of job elements among buyers of department stores in the following three sizes: (a) small department stores with sales volume under $\$ 300$ million, (b) medium-sized department stores with sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion, and
(C) large department stores with sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus. As a post hoc test, Scheffe for unequal sample sizes was used to find the locations of differences among buyers of department stores in different sizes.

Small department store buyers used events as an information source more extensively than did buyers of medium-sized or large stores. A resident buying office was less extensively used by large department store buyers than by buyers of stores in any other size. Large department store buyers placed a significantly lower rating on the importance of arranging/positioning than did buyers of other sized stores. Contacts with sales personnel were estimated as significantly more important by small department store buyers than by buyers of stores in any other size category.
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## CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Department stores have been under siege for the past 10 years and have been losing market share to specialty stores, off-price chains, catalog retailers, and other new types of stores ("Standard \& Poor's," 1988, 1989, 1990b, 1991). In terms of inflation-adjusted sales per square foot, department store retailing has barely grown in the past 10 years (Leas, 1990; "Standard \& Poor's," 1989).

Due to their enormous size, however, department stores have advantages over specialty stores. The advantages including the appeal of a one-stop shopping emporiums as destination stores, the breadth of assortment, depth of merchandise, good locations, and strong consumer franchise make department stores formidable competitors (Leas, 1990; "Standard \& Poor's," 1991, 1992). Traditional department store retailers are still the stable fashion force in the shopping mall ("Standard \& Poor's," 1991).

In recent years, department stores have placed more emphasis on apparel and eliminated a number of traditional areas, including major appliances, toys, and furniture ("What is a," 1990). Thus, department stores have
repositioned themselves as large, soft goods specialty outlets. In order to increase the productivity of their selling space and to serve higher income customers, they have been attempting to upscale in terms of merchandising and service (Gill, 1990; "Standard \& Poor's," 1989, 1990a, 1990b).

Although the number of department stores is predicted to decline, the survivors are expected to be stronger ("Standard \& Poor's," 1992). This retailing format has existed for over 100 years and should continue to survive as a successful retail format ("Standard \& Poor's," 1991).

The retail buyer plays a critical decision role in the typical channel through which fashion goods move (Greenberg, 1984). However, retail buyers' responsibilities are often described in general terms in textbooks. Clear distinctions are not made among buyers of various types and sizes of stores and different merchandise classifications (Fiorito, \& Fairhurst, 1989).

## Rationale for the study

Today's retail environment is highly competitive. Apparel retail stores fight for a share of a marketplace overwhelmed by overstoring, new types of stores, everchanging consumer demands, and the economic recession (Douglas-David, 1989b; Lewison, 1991; "Standard \& Poor's,"

1989, 1990, 1991). However, department stores are still the secure fashion force in shopping malls because of some advantages over specialty stores, including the appeal of a one-stop shopping center ("Standard \& Poor's," 1992).

The buyer's decisions are critical to the success of retail companies. However, previous research studies have provided little information regarding buyers' workeroriented behaviors across store, merchandise, or buyers' characteristics (Fiorito \& Fairhurst, 1989).

By identifying the worker-oriented behaviors of buyers, this study can aid department store retailers as well as other retailers who want to train and reeducate their buyers more effectively. By identifying the job components stated by buyers as the most important/extensively used activities, educators can better prepare students by emphasizing these job components in the curriculum.

Statement of the Problem
This research investigated worker-oriented behaviors of department store apparel buyers. The study answered the following question: Is there any difference in workeroriented behaviors of apparel buyers according to store size as measured by store's annual sales volume?
Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to investigate the job content of apparel buyer positions in department stores and make comparisons of job elements across store sizes measured by store's annual sales volume. The Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) was used to determine worker-oriented behaviors of buyers in six major categories.

## Objectives of the Study

Six worker-oriented behaviors that were studied through the PAQ included (a) information input, (b) mental processes, (c) work output (actions involved in jobs), (d) relationships with people (interpersonal activities in work), (e) job context, and (f) other job characteristics.
The main objectives of this study were to:

1. Investigate and compare information input of department store apparel buyers according to store sizes measured by store's annual sales volume.
2. Investigate and compare mental processes of department store apparel buyers according to store sizes measured by store's annual sales volume.
3. Investigate and compare work output of department store apparel buyers according to store sizes measured by store's annual sales volume.
4. Investigate and compare relationships with people of department store apparel buyers according to store sizes measured by store's annual sale volume.
5. Investigate and compare job context of department store apparel buyers according to store sizes measured by store's annual sales volume.
6. Investigate and compare other job characteristics of department store apparel buyers according to store sizes measured by store's annual sale volume.

Hypotheses
In order to complete the objectives of the study the following hypotheses were tested.

1. There is no significant difference in information input responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.
2. There is no significant difference in mental processes responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.
3. There is no significant difference in work output responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.
4. There is no significant difference in relationship with people responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.
5. There is no significant difference in job context responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.
6. There is no significant difference in other job characteristics responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.

Delimitations

1. Participants were limited to apparel buyers of department stores listed in "The Top 100 Department stores" published by Stores magazine (1991).
2. The measurement of store size was limited to store's annual sales volume.

Definition of Terms
Department store. Retailing institutions that include "traditional department stores and multi-department softgoods stores (or specialized department stores) with a fashion orientation, full markup policy and operating in stores large enough to be shopping center anchors" (Gill, 1990, p.8).

Merchandise classification. The breaking down of merchandise into groups of items similar in nature or in end use without regard for style, size, color, price, etc. (Ostrow \& Smith, 1985).

Price line. The predetermined retail price level at which an item is offered for sale (Ostrow \& Smith, 1985).

Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ). A research instrument copyrighted by the Purdue Research Foundation, designed to analyze job content in terms of worker-oriented behaviors (McMcormick, Jeanneret, \& Meacham, 1979)

Information Input. Deals with specifying ways in which workers receive information and the extent to which they use the information needed to perform their jobs. The primary ways individuals receive work-oriented information is by what they see and by what they hear.

Mental Processes. Deals with the processing of information that is obtained through the identified information sources or the information learned through training or experience.

Work Output (Actions Involved in Jobs). Deals with the physical work activities of a job. Output refers to something that is done, not necessarily something that is produced.

Relationships with Other Persons (Interpersonal Activities in Work). Deals with communications and personal contact with others, as well as supervision given and received.

Job Context. Describes with the work situation or work environment of the individual.

# Other Job Characteristics (Miscellaneous Aspects of <br> Work). Contains several miscellaneous items including those related to job demands and various job responsibilities. 

CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of literature pertinent to department store buyers and their job content was conducted. Because the term department store has been defined in several ways ("Standard \& Poor's," 1991), a review of several definitions by major sources is presented before one definition is employed for this study.

Increased competition is causing department store retailers to adjust their merchandising strategies to compete effectively. Thus, the status of the department store and functions of the retail buyer are discussed.

Although numerous studies have been conducted regarding the department store buyer, few studies have dealt with the job content of a retail buyer's position. Studies regarding job content analysis of small apparel shop managers and apparel buyers, and studies related to retail buyers are described.

## Definition of a Department store

Ostrow and Smith (1985) define a department store as "a large-scale retailing institution which sells a wide variety of goods, including hard lines, and which, with some
exceptions, provides its customers with extensive services" (p.67). Among the different types of department stores are traditional (also called conventional) department stores, departmentalized specialty stores, chain department stores, and discount department stores.

The traditional or conventional department store is the most clearly recognized form of department store. This type of the store is characterized by its downtown flagship and its emphasis on fashion and service. Examples are Macy's, Marshall Field's, the May Co., and Lazarus.

Departmentalized specialty stores carry a narrower assortment of goods concentrated at the high end in terms of price and fashion. These stores are exemplified by such stores as Neiman-Marcus, Nordstrom, and Saks Fifth Avenue.

Chain department stores include the mass merchandisers with their common format which have taken on many of the aspects of the traditional department store. Examples are Sears, J.C. Penney, and Montgomery Ward. Today many traditional department stores are also members of a chain.

Another form of department store, the discounter is characterized by low margins and self-service. These stores sell general merchandise in such great varieties that they may also be regarded as department stores. Included are K-mart, Wal-Mart, and Target.

The U.S. Department of Commerce definition of a department store (SIC 531) was formulated in 1972. It defines department stores as follows:

Retail stores generally carrying a general line of apparel, such as suits, coats, dresses, and furnishings; homefurnishings, such as funiture, floor coverings, curtains, draperies, linens, and major household appliances; and housewares, such as table and kitchen appliances, dishes, and utensils. These stores must carry men's and women's apparel and either major household appliances or other homefurnishings. These and other merchandise lines are normally arranged in separate sections or departments with the accounting on a departmentalized basis. The departments and functions are integrated under a single management. The stores usually provide their own charge accounts, deliver merchandise, and maintain open stocks. These stores normally have 50 employees or more ("Standard Industrial Classification Manual," 1987, p. 317).

The Department of commerce definition differentiates conventional department stores from discount and national chain department stores. It specifies that conventional department stores in addition to satisfying the criteria of a department store usually provide check-out service and personal customer assistance within each department. Such conventional stores may have a catalog order desk and are not members of a national chain.

In 1987 Stores magazine, a publication of the National
Retail Federation (formerly the National Retail Merchants Association) reported that the criteria specified in the Department of Commerce definition of a department store were no longer valid and established a new definition to use in
determining retail store divisions and companies to place on its annual listing of the Top 100 Department Stores. This new department store definition included the beginning of SIC 531 but defined the merchandise lines differently. Stores' new definition stated that their annual Top 100 list included "traditional department stores and multi-department soft goods stores (or specialized department stores) with a fashion orientation, full markup policy and operating in stores large enough to be shopping center anchors" (Bergmann, 1987, p. 81). Excluded from this list were general merchandise chains, catalog chains, discount stores, mass merchandisers, and specialty chains.

Some retail companies that previously appeared on Stores' Top 100 Specialty Chains listing were placed on the Top 100 Department Store listing for the first time in July 1987. These stores included large departmentalized specialty stores such as Nordstrom, Saks Fifth Avenue, Neiman Marcus, I. Magnin, and Jacobsons. The reason given by the editor of stores for this shift was that the firms were operated more like department stores than like specialty stores. Store size, expense structure, merchandise lines, and departmental structure, and ways of operating were much more similar to department stores than to the narrowly focused specialty stores on the Top 100 Specialty list (Bergmann, 1987).

In 1990 Stores magazine re-examined the question "What is a department store?" and placed J. C. Penney on its Top 100 Department Store list. As Bergmann, editor of Stores magazine, wrote in her monthly editorial, "the perceptions and definitions, if indeed there are definitions, keep changing even as department stores themselves keep changing, adjusting their merchandise mixes and what they perceive to be an appropriate level of service" (Bergmann, 1990, p. 8). The reason given for rating J. C. Penney as a department store company was that J. C. Penney's merchandise mix, its ambience, and its service level qualified it as a moderatepriced department store.

Status of the Department Store
With myriads of store types available to consumers, today's retail environment is extremely competitive (Crites, 1992; Ghosh, 1990; Lewison, 1991). The rush to build shopping complexes during the 1970s and 1980s left America overstored ("Standard \& Poor's," 1989, 1990), resulting in 15 square feet of retail space for every man, woman, and child in the United States ("Standard \& Poor's", 1990).

Department stores have been under siege for the past 10 years. In terms of inflation-adjusted sales per square foot, department store retailing has barely grown since 1980 (Leas, 1990; "Standard \& Poor's," 1989). The space productivity of department stores, also, has been flat at
\$151 per square foot of selling space, with variations up and down in the past five years (Leas, 1990; "Standard \& Poor's", 1992).

Historically, the department store has offered a full assortment of general merchandise and apparel for family on a year around basis ("Standard \& Poor's", 1990b). Because of this traditional assortment of merchandise, department stores have been losing market share to specialty stores with their depth of merchandise in selected categories, to general merchandisers with their low price appeal, and to off-price merchants with their high quality for less. In addition, department stores have been competing with catalog retailers, category killers, and other new types of stores (Leas, 1990; "Standard \& Poor's," 1988, 1989, 1990b, 1991). Due to their enormous size, however, department stores have advantages over specialty stores. The advantages, including the appeal of one-stop shopping emporiums as destination stores, the breadth of assortment, depth of merchandise, good locations, and strong consumer franchise, make department stores formidable competitors (Leas, 1990; "Standard \& Poor's," 1991, 1992).

In recent years, many department store have placed more emphasis on apparel and eliminated a number of traditional areas, including major appliances, toys, and furniture (Gill, 1990; Bergmann, 1990). Thus, department stores have
repositioned themselves as large, soft goods specialty outlets. In a typical department store women's and men's wear comprise over 55\% of the total store business. Among clothing categories women's wear has been emphasized by department store retailers. Of the total store business, almost half of merchandise comprises some category of women's wear ("Merchandising and operating," 1987).

Traditional department store retailers are still the stable fashion force in the shopping mall ("Standard \& Poor," 1990b, 1991). Leading department stores are attempting to focus on a reputation for fashion leadership, full assortments, and customer service ("Standard \& Poor's," 1991).

In order to increase the productivity of their selling space and to serve higher income customers, department store retailers have shifted their emphasis to higher priced merchandise and unscaled their fashion image (Gill, 1990; "Standard \& Poor's," 1989, 1990a, 1990b). They have offered a wider variety of selections of women's apparel and accessories, recruited new designers, and expanded cosmetics counters (Standard \& Poor's", 1990a). Department stores are expected to reflect the preferences of specific, targeted customer groups ("Standard \& Poor's," 1990b). By embracing segmentation, or imitating
niche retailers, some department stores are projecting a specialty store ambiance ("Standard \& Poor's," 1990a).

Department stores of the 1990s are facing the following challenges: price, service, convenience, merchandise, selection, merchandise presentation, and a recognition of the changing population and its tastes, needs, wants and desires (Gill, 1990). Although the number of department stores is predicted to decline, the survivors are expected to be stronger ("Standard \& Poor's," 1992). This retailing format has existed for over 100 years and is expected to continue as a successful retail format ("Standard \& Poor's," 1991)

Functions of the Retail Buyer
Under today's competitive retail environment, the function of the retail buyer is to select and buy saleable merchandise (Jernigan \& Esterling, 1990; Stone \& Cassill, 1989). All goods distributed by retail institutions are purchased by their buyers. Because of their status in merchandising divisions, which are hubs of retail store operations, buyers exert a more direct influence on buying and selling activities than does any other store executive (Jernigan \& Esterling, 1990). As such, the retail buyer is viewed as an expert in evaluating the effects of product characteristics, pricing policies, and promotional
opportunities on the salability of merchandise (Ettenson, \& Wagner, 1986).

In a department store the buyer's job has long been regarded as the most critical job responsibility (Joseph, 1977; Strahl, 1953). The advent of the branch store in the 1950s placed even greater importance upon the buying function by expanding the activities to handle branch departments (Henry, 1965).

Retail buying can be defined as the decision-making process through which the retail buyer identifies, evaluates, and selects saleable merchandise (Ettenson, \& Wagner, 1986). The retail buyer plays an even more critical decision role when fashion goods are involved (Greenberg, 1984). Retail buyers are expected to evaluate and integrate a wide variety of information when making decisions (Sheth, 1973).

However, retail buyers' responsibilities are often described in general terms in textbooks. Clear distinctions are not made among buyers of various types and sizes of stores and different merchandise classifications (Fiorito, \& Fairhurst, 1989).

Job Content Analysis
The Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) is a research instrument developed and copyrighted by the Purdue Research Foundation. It was designed to analyze job content in terms
of worker-oriented behaviors and has become one of the most accepted and useful instruments for analyzing workeroriented behavior (Harvey, Hakel, Friedman, \& Cornelius III, 1988; McCormick, Jeanneret, \& Mecham, 1977).

The development of the PAQ was begun in 1959 at the Occupational Research Center at Purdue University. Financial support from the U.S. Office of Naval Research backed the research effort of Mecham, McCormick, and Jeanneret (1977).

The PAQ is a structured job analysis instrumentconsisting of 194 worker-oriented job elements. It has been used in determining aptitude requirements and rates of pay for jobs. A six-point numerical rating scale allows for the use of statistical comparisons and predictions. The PAQ describes jobs in terms of six divisions. These include (a) sources of job information, (b) mental processes required to perform jobs, (c) responses or actions involved in jobs, (d) interpersonal activities in work and with the work situation, (e) job context, and (f) miscellaneous aspects of work. A brief description of these elements follows (McCormick et al., 1977)

Information Input deals with specifying says in which workers receive information and the extent to which they use the information needed to perform their jobs. The primary
ways individuals receive work-oriented information is by what they see and by what they hear.

Mental Processes deals with the processing of information that is obtained through the identified information sources or the information learned through training or experience.

Work Output (Actions Involved in Jobs) deals with the physical work activities of a job. Output refers to something that is done, not necessarily something that is produced.

Relationships with Other Persons (Interpersonal Activities in Work) deals with communications and personal contact with others, as well as supervision given and received.

Job Context describes the work situation or work environment of the individual.

Other Job Characteristics (Miscellaneous Aspects of Work) describes several miscellaneous items including those related to job demands and various job responsibilities.

## Retail Studies Using the PAQ

Studies by Cheek (1992) and Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989, 1993) used the PAQ to investigate retail job content. Cheek (1992) studied the job content the job content of apparel store managers. Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989, 1993)
analyzed and compared the job content of buyers in department stores and independent specialty stores across.

## Buyers' Job Content

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989, 1993) adapted the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) to study the job content of store buyers in four merchandise categories: women's, men's, and children's apparel, and other apparel and accessories. Data were collected from 100 department store buyers and 153 independent specialty store buyers.

The small apparel store buyers surveyed by Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989, 1993) were educated and experienced and showed general agreement about the content of their buying jobs. A high percentage ( $82 \%$ ) were female. Over threefourths had three or more years of buying experience, and 56\% had completed a bachelor's or advanced degree. The majority of stores (61\%) sold women's apparel, $30 \%$ sold men's or children's apparel, and $9 \%$ sold accessories or other apparel categories such as maternity, lingerie or active sportswear. More than $80 \%$ of the small retail stores were classified as specialty stores, had 10 or fewer employees, and had an annual sales volume of $\$ 500,000$ or less.

As with the buyers from small stores, a high percentage of the department store buyers surveyed by Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) were female (75\%). Slightly less than two-
thirds had three or more years of buying experience, and the largest merchandise category purchased was women's wear (49\%). A high percentage of the department store buyers had completed a bachelor's or advanced degree (79.4\%).

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989) found that the sources of information used most often by small store buyers were inventory and consumer behavior. Fiorito and Fairhurst reported that buyers let their inventory and consumer's reaction to merchandise be the primary sources of information for further purchases. Judging quality was the most important activity in the second PAQ subdivision of Information Input.

The least frequently used source of information used by small store buyers as identified by Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989) was the buying office. Few small store buyers in their study utilized a buying office. The least important activity in the second PAQ subdivision of Information Input was estimating time.

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989) found that decision making was the most important job element in Mental Processes to small store buyers. Compiling information appeared to be the least important although all elements in Mental Processes were important to buyers to a high degree in their job.

In regard to Work Output an interesting finding in the study by Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989) was the lack of importance given by small store buyers to using keyboard devices. Using computers was found to be not as important in their Work Output as were arranging/positioning and handling objects.

The study by Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989) showed that the most important relationships with other persons were advising, instructing, and routine exchange of information. Public speaking was the least important. Small store buyers perceived contacts with customers and sales personnel as the most important job-related personal contacts, and contacts with supervisor were least important.

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989) found that personal sacrifice and frustrating situations were the most important job context to small store buyers. Strained personal contact and interpersonal conflict appeared to be the least important job context.

Among Other Job Characteristics, the most important elements to small store buyers as identified by Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989) were updating job knowledge and attention to detail. The least important element in the last PAQ subdivision of Other Job Characteristics was following set procedures.

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) found that small store buyers and large store buyers perceived inventory, judging condition/quality, estimating quantity, decision making, and personal sacrifice as being important or frequently used on their job. The following job content elements were estimated by Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) to be relatively low in importance or frequency of use for small store buyers and large store buyers: written materials, combining/ compiling information, public speaking, contacts with students, and repetitive activities and watchfulness of infrequent events.

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) compared importance/ frequency of use of job elements between large store buyers and small store buyers. Some content areas were the same (e.g., judging quality, estimating quantity, making decisions, using inventory as a source of information) while others were different (e.g., quantitative information and buying offices were frequently used by large store buyers while small store buyers used consumer behavior and window displays). Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) found that large store buyers tend to be more quantitative oriented and small store buyers tend to be more customer and community oriented. Thus, Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) concluded that these two positions required people with different skills. Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) suggested that there may be
differences between the buyer's job content in different store types (holding size constant), and there may be differences between the buyer's job content in relation to the company's utilization of technology.

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989) used multivariate analysis (MANOVA) and the paired comparison t-tests to compare small store buyers's responses in regard to frequency of usage/importance of the job elements across four different merchandise categories. There were no significant differences between the four merchandise categories at the significance level of .001.

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989) reported eight differences that would have been significant had the .05 level been used. In division one, Information Input, there was a difference in the importance of color perception and estimating sizes placed by small store buyers across four different merchandise categories. Within the Work Output division, the amount of physical exertion needed for the job was differently stated by small store buyers of various merchandise categories. Regarding Relationships with Other Persons, persuading was viewed significantly more important by small store buyers of women's wear and other apparel. The differences existed in the importance of relationships with semi-professional personnel among small store buyers of
different merchandise categories. Within Job Context, small store buyers in some merchandise categories placed significantly more importance on civic obligations. In Other Job Characteristics, the importance on travel was considered differently among buyers of different merchandise categories. Buyers of various merchandise categories assumed different levels of responsibility for waste and damages in their stores.

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) used Bonferroni paired comparison t-tests to compare frequency of usage/importance of the buyer's job elements between small and large retail firms. The ranking that was given each job content element was not tested for significance as the most important or frequently used element within each PAQ division. It was simply meant to help in the comparison of job content elements between large store buyers and small store buyers.

Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) found that large store buyers perceived that buyers need a significantly greater amount of education, a longer training period, and a greater level of math skills than did small store buyers. Small store buyers perceived a higher degree of responsibility for waste, a greater amount of physical exertion to perform their jobs, and higher degree to which their performance is critical to the organization than did large store buyers. The only job content element which was not perceived
differently in this grouping was the amount of job experience required for the buyer's job. Both large store buyers and small store buyers perceived that one to three years was necessary.

Out of the 57 job content elements in six PAQ divisions, Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) reported that 37 (65\%) were perceived differently by small store buyers and large store buyers at the level of $\mathrm{p}<.01$, and 31 (54\%) were perceived differently, p < .001. In the first PAQ division, Information Input, six of the nine job content elements in the subdivision sources of information were perceived differently by large store buyers and small store buyers. Quantitative information was ranked as the most frequently used source of information for large store buyers while consumer behavior was number one for small store buyers. In the second subdivision, activities for the completion of the job, t-test results indicated that three of the six job content elements were perceived differently by large store buyers and small store buyers. Judging condition/quality and estimating quantity were found to be very important to both large store buyers and small store buyers were not perceived differently by buyers.

In the second PAQ division, Mental Processes, Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) reported that three of the six job content elements were perceived differently by large store
buyers and small store buyers. Buyers indicated the greatest amount of similarity in their perceptions of their job content in this division. The results showed that small and large store buyers frequently used all six mental processes on their job, and the mental processes were ranked roughly in the same order for both groups of buyers.

In the third PAQ division, Interpersonal Activities in Work, and the first subdivision, Relationships with Other Persons, the study results by Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) showed that three of the seven job content elements were perceived differently by large store buyers and small store buyers. Negotiating appeared to be of extreme importance to large store buyers while advertising and instructing had the highest means for small store buyers. This finding indicates a very differently perception of the buying job for large store buyers and small store buyers. In the second division, Job Required Personal Contacts, nine of the ten job content elements were perceived differently by large store buyers and small store buyers. Middle management was perceived as a very important contact for large store buyers while small store buyers indicated that customers were an extremely important job-required personal contact.

In the fourth PAQ division, Work Output, Fiorito and Fairhurst (1993) reported that all three of the job content elements were perceived differently by large store buyers
and small store buyers. Keyboard devices were very important to large store buyers while small store buyers perceived them to be only moderately important to their jobs.

In the fifth PAQ division, Job Context, three of the five job content elements were perceived differently by large store buyers and small store buyers. Small store buyers feel a greater responsibility to their communities as part of their jobs than do large store buyers.

In the last $P A Q$ division, Other Job Characteristics, seven of the 11 job content elements were perceived differently by large store buyers and small store buyers. Time pressure and precision/accuracy were very important job demands to large store buyers while updating job knowledge and attention to detail were the two most important job characteristics to the small store buyers.

## Managers' Job Content

Cheek (1992) analyzed the job content of managers' positions in independent apparel shops. Cheek's sample consisted of 145 independent apparel shop managers in Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, and Oklahoma. Of the respondents, $56.6 \%$ were female, $60.1 \%$ were college graduates, and $69.4 \%$ had more than 10 years of experience as store managers. The majority (76.4\%) were over the age of 40 , and $45.5 \%$ were 50 or older.

Cheek (1992) compared mean scores of each job element in the six PAQ divisions to determine which one store managers considered the most important/frequently used and least important/frequently used. In the first division, for Sources of Information, observing inventory was considered the most important source of information and buying offices the least important source. For activities for completion of the job, judging condition/quality was considered the most important while estimating time was the least important. Under the second division of the PAQ, Mental Processes, decision making was viewed as the most important and compiling information the least important. In Work Output, the third division, arranging and positioning materials was determined to be the most important job element and keyboard devices were rated the least important. The least important type of communication was public speaking and the most important activities in relations with people were advising, and instructing. store managers placed the most importance on contacts with customers and the least importance on contacts with supervisors. In job context, frustrating situation and personal sacrifices were the most important job elements, and interpersonal conflict was the least important. Under the last PAQ division, attention to detail was viewed as the most important job
demand and following a set procedure was least important one.

Chi-square analysis was conducted by Cheek to investigate differences in managers' responses regarding frequency of usage/importance of job elements according to gender, manager categories, annual sales volume, price lines, and merchandise categories. Cheek reported results at the significance level of .001 to reduce the possibility of Type I error because 57 tests were completed for each comparison.

Cheek's results indicated a significant difference in the degree of importance on interacting with executives. Managers of women's apparel shops chose "moderate level of importance" significantly more often than expected when compared to mangers of men's, and women's and men's apparel shops. Mangers of men's apparel shops chose "substantial level of importance" significantly more often than expected when compared with other categories. Mangers of women's apparel shops chose "extremely important" significantly less often than did managers of other categories.

The Mantel-Haenszel test was used to compare linear relationships between annual sales volume and price lines and manager responses. Significantly positive relationships above the level of .001 were found between annual sales volume and manager responses. As sales volume increased,
the managers placed more importance on instructing, contact with executives, middle management, supervisors, and clerical personnel.

There was a negative linear relationship, at the significance level of . 001 , between annual sales volume and the importance placed by store managers on the job elements in work output. The lower the shop's sales volume, the more importance the manager placed on the following job elements: arranging and positioning objects and materials, and physically handling objects and materials.

Studies Related to Retail Buyers
Strahl (1953) analyzed the job of the department store buyer in the form of a case study for the purpose of job training for buyers. Analysis of the activities performed by all buying staffs studied revealed the nature of the typical buyer's responsibility for selling, buying, pricing, and stocking. It was found that buyers needed to contact numerous resources, select specific pieces of merchandise, negotiate terms, and develop and maintain good relations with vendors. Buyers were responsible for pricing, stockkeeping, directing the flow of their goods through the store, displaying them, and maintaining and protecting them.

Strahl concluded that the buyers placed significant importance on 13 merchandising and service tasks. Six merchandising tasks included (a) determination of kinds of
merchandise to order, (b) decisions as to quantities of each kind of goods to order, (c) selection of items to be given special promotion, (d) planning of promotional copy, (e) repricing of slow-selling merchandise, and (f) comprehension of departmental figure. The remaining seven service tasks included (a) planning the buyer's own work, (b) handling customer returns and complaints, (c) supervising sales in heavy customer traffics, (d) instructing workers, (e) arousing enthusiasm in salespeople, (f) determining standards of performance for workers, and (g) correcting subordinates.

As the predictors of successful performance for department store buyers, the personality attributes and background information of buyers were studied by Joseph (1977). The study results indicated that superior buyers tended to be more efficient in terms of their general work performance habits, more emotionally stable and serene, had a greater need for autonomy, and were more enduring with a difficult job and seeing it through to its conclusion. The more successful buyers tended to be married and had more formal education than did the less successful buyers. Martin (1973), also, concluded that buyers for successful stores were more aggressive, more self-confident, and showed a greater tendency for leadership in new merchandise trends than buyers for failing stores.

Kean (1957) studied retail buyers' opinions and perceptions regarding continuing education. The study results showed that retail buyers considered decision making, negotiating, and interpersonal skills as the three most important skills. The buyers, also, rated customer profiles as the single most important reference in addition to economic trend reports. Television and radio news media were the sources used most often by the buyers to obtain information about current events.

The associations among the buying functions, role conception and demographic background of retailing buyers were investigated by Howerton (1983). She found that buyers' opinions relative to specific role conceptions were significantly related to age and buying experience. Eight buying functions were significantly associated to age, buying experience, and education. In addition, significant relationships existed between five of the role conceptions and the total number of buying functions, while all the function factors were found to be significantly related to at least one or the role conception factors. However, Cox (1984) concluded, in his study of department store buyers projection of items' initial sales, that buying experience did not have a statistically significant effect on the degree to which they predicted products' sales.

A research study regarding role clarity among department store buyers and its association with job related factors was conducted by Wang (1987). The author concluded that role clarity was positively associated with job satisfaction, and negatively associated with job tension and propensity to leave the corporation. Also, role clarity and job related factors were significantly associated with socio-demographic characteristics, characteristics of their place of employment, and organizational characteristics. Such characteristics include age, education, income, job title, length of time as a buyer, length of time in present position, and length of service, the number of employees and buyers in the corporation, and the length of time spent in the training.

## Summary

Department stores have been losing market share to specialty stores, off-price chains, catalog retailers, and other new types of store. Thus, department store have repositioned themselves as large, soft goods specialty outlets. The retail buyers plays a critical decision role in the typical channel through which fashion goods move. Although numerous studies have been conducted regarding the department store buyer, few studies have dealt with the job content of a retail buyer's position.

Studies by Cheek (1992), and Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989, 1993) used the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) to investigate retail job content. Cheek (1992) analyzed the job content of apparel store managers according to gender, manager categories, annual sales volume, price lines, and merchandise categories. Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989, 1993) adapted the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) to analyze the job content of apparel buyers across four merchandise categories and between large and small retail firms.

## CHAPTER III

## METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the job content of apparel buyer positions in department stores and make comparisons of job elements according to company's annual sales volume. The Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) was used to determine worker-oriented behaviors in six major categories. This chapter describes the procedures followed in conducting the research. Included are selection of the sample, the data collection instrument, data collection, and analysis of data.

## Selection of the Sample

The population for this study was apparel buyers of retail stores listed on Stores magazine's 1990 listing of the Top 100 Department Stores (Schulz, 1991). The buying division of each store was contacted by telephone to confirm that the company was still in business. Stores that had ceased operation were eliminated from the selection process. Also, excluded were stores that had combined buying offices with more than one retail division or buying offices located in more than one place. After these exclusions, the sample included 8 stores with an annual sales volume of more than
\$1 billion, 15 stores with $\$ 300$ million to $\$ 1$ billion, and 19 stores with under $\$ 300$ million.

Apparel buyers names were obtained from Sheldon's
Retail Directory (1992). To select the sample these buyers names were listed according to three annual sales volume categories. Within these categories, then, the buyers were listed by the following merchandise categories: (a) women's wear, (b) men's wear, and (c) children's wear. Table I shows the distribution of the population of department store apparel buyers according to annual store sales volumes and merchandise categories.

Table 1
Distribution of the Population by Company Annual Sales Volume and Merchandise Classification

| ANNUAL SALES VOLUME | WOMEN'S HEAR BUYERS | MEN'S HEAR BUYERS | CHILDREN'S MEAR BUYERS | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$1 BILLION PLUS | 223 | 83 | 50 | 356 |
| \$1 BILLION-\$300 MILLION | 257 | 98 | 63 | 418 |
| UNDER \$300 MILLİN | 148 | 58 | 53 | 259 |
| total | 628 | 239 | 166 | 1033 |

From each of the three annual sales volume categories 250 subjects were selected to participate in the study. Because of their low numbers, all men's wear buyers and children's wear buyers in the population were included in
the study sample. With the exception of buyers for women's underwear, hosiery, maternity wear, and bridal, all women's wear buyers were listed for the three annual sales volume categories. As shown in Table 2, the number of women's wear buyers for each annual sales volume category was determined by subtracting the combined number of men's wear and children's wear buyers from 250. Thus, the total number of buyers for each annual sales volume category was 250. Women's wear buyers were randomly selected at the needed number for each category.

Table 2
Distribution of the Sample by Company Annual Sales Volume and Merchandise classification

| ANNUAL SALES VOLUME | WOMEN'S HEAR <br> BUYERS | MEN'S HEAR <br> BUYERS | CHILDREN 'S WEAR <br> BUYERS | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 117 | 83 | 50 | 250 |
| \$1 BILLION PLUS | 89 | 98 | 63 | 250 |
| \$1 BILLION-\$300 MILLION | 139 | 58 | 53 | 250 |
| UNDER \$300 MILLION | 345 | 239 | 166 | 750 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Data Collection Instrument
The survey instrument (See Appendix A) was developed by the researcher based on a review of related literature. A part of the questionnaire was based on the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) and was designed to investigate buyers'
worker-oriented behaviors in six major categories. These six categories included the following: information input, mental processes, work output, relationships with other persons, job context, and other job characteristics. The PAQ questions were incorporated into the following questions: Q1-Q8, Q20, Q21, Q22, Q23. A total of 12 questions consisting of 60 items comprised this part of the questionnaire. Six-point Likert-type scale measurements were used.

The PAQ describes jobs in terms of six divisions. These include (a) information input, (b) mental processes required to perform jobs, (c) responses or actions involved in jobs, (d) interpersonal activities in work and with the work situation, (e) job context, and (f) miscellaneous aspects of work.

Questions 1 and 5, division of Information Input, deal with activities as the ways in which workers receive information and the extent to which they use the information needed to perform their jobs. Question 1 concerns the importance of the activities and Question 5 considers the extent of usage in the information sources to perform the job.

Question 2, Mental Processes, deals with the processing of information that is obtained through the identified
information sources or the information learned through training or experience.

Question 3 and 4 are sub-divisions of Relationships with Other Persons. Question 3 deals with personal contacts with others, and Question 4 deals with types of communication with others.

Question 6 describes Job Context which is the work situation or work environment of the individual.

Question 7 deals with Work Output (Actions Involved in Jobs), which are the physical work activities of a job. Work Output refers to something that is done, not necessarily something that is produced.

Question 8 deals with Other Job Characteristics (Miscellaneous Aspects of Work) which contains several miscellaneous items including those related to job demands and various job responsibilities.

Questions 9-19 of the questionnaire, a total of 11 items, were designed to obtain descriptive information regarding individual characteristics of buyers, their stores, and the merchandise they purchased. Questions 9-14, sought buyer's personal characteristics including gender, age, the highest level of education, major area of in college, years of work-experience as a retail buyer and in retail industry. Other information gathered concerned type of merchandise purchased, end-use categories of merchandise
purchased, price points, and annual sales volumes for buyer's department and store. These questions, Q15-Q19, totaled 5 items.

The formatting of PAQ questions was based on the Position Analysis Questionnaire developed by Purdue University and published by California Consulting Psychologists Press. Questions were, also, based on the studies reported by Fiorito and Fairhurst (1989), and Cheek (1992).

A pilot study was conducted using 36 randomly selected buyers. Questionnaires were returned by 9 of the 36 buyers. Based on data from the pilot study the annual sales volume categories were reduced from four three before mailing the questionnaire to the study sample. This change was made because the small volume stores had too few buyers.

Data Collection
The survey of department store apparel buyers was conducted following the method described in Dillman's Mail and Telephone Surveys (1978). A packet, consisting of a cover letter (Appendix B), a questionnaire (Appendix A), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope was mailed to each sample participant.

According to Dillman's suggestion, the cover letters explained the purpose of the study, the importance of the
recipient's participation, the promise of respondent confidentiality, and the usefulness of the study. The author's telephone number, and a statement expressing appreciation for the respondent's participation in the study were included. Cover letters were individually generated by word processor to facilitate personalization of the correspondence. Follow-up mailings were not conducted even though these might have increased the response rate.

Analysis of Data
In order to analyze and compare the worker-oriented behavior of department store apparel buyers, descriptive and inferential statistical analysis were conducted based on the questionnaire data obtained from the survey respondents. Buyers' responses were loaded into Texas Woman's University's VAX computer. The BMDP statistical package was used to calculate frequency counts and percentages of buyers' individual characteristics, and store and merchandise characteristics.

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to compare and test whether significant differences existed in the six categories of worker-oriented job elements according to stores' annual sales volume, merchandise classification, price line, gender, education
level, and years of experience. The . 001 level of significance was adopted to evaluate the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) values obtained because of the high probability of Type I error when a large number of tests ( 55 tests for 6 hypotheses in this study) are completed using data from same subjects.

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to analyze and compare the job content of department store apparel buyers. Included in this chapter are: (a) description of subjects, (b) description of store and merchandise characteristics, (c) the importance and the extent of use of PAQ job elements, and (d) comparisons of job elements of PAQ by company's annual sales volume.

Description of Subjects
The sample consisted of traditional department store buyers who purchased women's, men's or children's apparel. Questionnaires were distributed to 750 buyers in 42 department stores. Questionnaires were returned by 185 buyers, giving a $24.7 \%$ response rate. All of the returned questionnaires were used in the study.

Demographic information gathered on department store apparel buyers is presented in Table 3. Individual characteristics of the buyers included: gender, age, education, major area, total years of experience in retailing, and years of experience as a buyer.

## Gender and Age

Among the total subjects $(\underline{N}=185), 68$ apparel buyers (36.8\%) were female, and 117 buyers ( $63.2 \%$ ) were male (Table 3). The largest group of buyers were between 30 and 39 years of age (51.9\%). Thirty-six buyers (19.5\%) were between age 40 and 49 , and 34 buyers (18.4\%) were under 30 years of age. There were 19 buyers (10.3\%) over age 50 .

## Education and Major Area

The majority (78.4\%) of all buyers had a bachelor's or advanced degree. Twenty-one percent of all buyers had vocational/technical school training, and 13\% had some college education. Six percent had a high school education only.

The most common degree was in business administration (38.7\%). Degrees in fashion merchandising were the second most common (17.2\%), and $16 \%$ of the respondents held degrees in arts and sciences. Nine percent of all buyers majored in marketing, $7 \%$ in home economics, and $6 \%$ in education. Degrees in other major areas accounted for $14.6 \%$ of the sample.

## Years of Retail Experience

The largest group of buyers (46.7\%) had between 5 and 14 years of experience in retailing (Table 3). The second
largest group (34.1\%) had 15 to 24 years of experience in retailing.

Table 3
Distributions of Individual Characteristics of Subjects

| Variable | $\underline{N}$ | Classification | $\underline{n}$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 185 | Male | 68 | 36.8 |
|  |  | Female | 117 | 63.2 |
| Age | 185 | Under 30 | 34 | 18.4 |
|  |  | 30-39 | 96 | 51.9 |
|  |  | 40-49 | 36 | 9.5 |
|  |  | Over 50 | 19 | 10.3 |
| Education | 185 | High School | 6 | 3.2 |
|  |  | Vocational/technical | 4 | 2.2 |
|  |  | School | 13 | 7.0 |
|  |  | Some College <br> Junior College Degree | 17 | 9.2 |
|  |  | Bachelor's Degree | 125 | 67.6 |
|  |  | Some Graduate School | 10 | 5.4 |
|  |  | Graduate School | 10 | 5.4 |
| Major Area | 185 | Arts and Sciences | 26 | 16.0 |
|  |  | Business | 63 | 38.7 |
|  |  | Administration | 6 | 3.7 |
|  |  | Education | 28 | 17.2 |
|  |  | Fashion Merchandising | 7 | 4.3 |
|  |  | Home Economics | 9 | 5.5 |
|  |  | Marketing Other | 24 | 14.6 |
| Years of Experience in Retailing | 185 | Less than 5 Years | 10 | 5.5 |
|  |  | 5-14 Years | 85 | 46.7 |
|  |  | 15-24 Years | 62 | 34.1 |
|  |  | More than 25 Years | 25 | 13.7 |
| Years of Experience as a Buyer | 185 | Less than 5 Years | 58 | 31.4 |
|  |  | 5-14 Years | 86 | 46.5 |
|  |  | 15-24 Years | 33 | 17.8 |
|  |  | More than 25 Years | 8 | 4.3 |

Among all buyers, $46.5 \%$ had 5 to 14 years of experience as a buyer, and $31.4 \%$ had less than 5 years experience. Thus, the majority of all buyers (77.9\%) had less than 15 years of buying experience.

Description of Store and Merchandise Characteristics

Descriptive information gathered on the department store where subjects worked included company annual sales volume, annual sales volume of buyer's department, classification of merchandise, categories of merchandise, and price points of merchandise.

## Dollar Annual Sales Volumes by Company and Department

The largest group of stores (40.1\%) had an annual sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion or more. On the other hand, $33.3 \%$ of the stores had an annual sales volume under $\$ 300$ million, and $26.5 \%$ had between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion (Table 4).

About half (52.5\%) of the buyers reported a department annual sales volume under $\$ 10$ million. The second largest group of buyers ( $35.0 \%$ ) had a departmental sales volume between $\$ 10$ million and $\$ 99$ million. of the remainder of buyers, $7.1 \%$ reported between $\$ 100$ million and $\$ 249$ million, and $5.5 \%$ of them had departmental sales of $\$ 250$ million.

Table 4
Distribution of Annual Sales Volumes for Company and Buyer's Department

| Variable | N | Classification | $\underline{n}$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Sales Volume of a Company | 177 | Under \$300 million | 59 | 33.3 |
|  |  | \$300 million- |  |  |
|  |  | 1 billion | 47 | 26.6 |
|  |  | \$1 billion plus | 71 | 40.1 |
| Annual Sales Volume of a Department | 183 | Under \$10 million | 96 | 52.5 |
|  |  | \$10-99 million | 64 | 35.0 |
|  |  | \$100-249 million | 13 | 7.1 |
|  |  | \$250 million plus | 10 | 5.5 |

Note. N does not total 185 because not all buyers responded to the questions regarding sales volume.

## Classification and End-Use Categories of Merchandise

Buyers made multiple selections regarding the classification and end-use categories of merchandise. The largest group of buyers (77) purchased women's wear. Sixtyfive buyers bought men's wear, and 44 bought children's wear (Table 5). One men's wear buyer purchased men's shoes, and two children's apparel buyers purchased both toys and children's furniture.

Among the 77 women's wear buyers, the largest group of buyers (39) bought one end-use category of women's apparel, 14 bought two categories, and 16 bought three categories.

Five women's wear buyers purchased four categories, and 3 purchased five or six categories. Thirty-nine women's wear buyers purchased career apparel, 37 purchased spectator sportswear, 26 bought active sportswear, and 18 bought casual dresses (Table 5).

Among 65 men's wear buyers, the largest number (52) purchased one end-use category of men's apparel, 8 purchased two categories, 2 purchased three categories, and 2 purchased four categories. The largest number of men's wear buyers (50) purchased sportswear. Nineteen buyers bought tailored clothing, and 10 buyers bought men's furnishings (Table 5).

Price Points of Merchandise
The buyers were asked to indicate the price points of merchandise they purchased. Buyers in medium-sized and small stores usually purchased more than one merchandise price point. Even in large stores buyers of men's and children's wear sometimes bought more than one price point of merchandise.

The largest group (72) of department store apparel buyers purchased one price point of merchandise, 70 buyers purchased two price points, and 32 purchased three price points. Only a few buyers (8) bought more than four price points of merchandise.

The largest group of buyers (149) purchased moderatepriced apparel. One hundred buyers bought better-priced apparel, and 62 buyers bought popular-priced apparel.

Table 5
Description of Classification, End-Use Categories and Price Points of Merchandise

| Variable | Classification | $\underline{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Merchandise |  |  |
| Classification | Women's Wear | 77 |
|  | Men's Wear | 65 |
| Women's Wear | Children's Wear | 44 |
| Categories | Other | 2 |
|  | Coats/Suits | 5 |
|  | Career Apparel | 39 |
|  | Casual Dresses | 18 |
|  | Special Occasion | 12 |
|  | Dresses |  |
|  | Sportswear-active | 26 |
|  | Sportswear-spectator | 37 |
|  | Lingerie/loungewear | 1 |
|  | Other | 9 |
| Men's Wear | Men's Furnishing | 10 |
| Categories | Tailored Clothing | 19 |
|  | Sportswear | 50 |
|  | Other | 6 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Popular | 62 |
|  | Moderate | 149 |
|  | Better | 100 |
|  | Bridge | 13 |
|  | Designer | 0 |
|  | Other |  |
|  |  |  |

The Importance and the Extent of Use of PAQ Job Elements

Mean values for variables in the six divisions of the PAQ job elements are represented in Tables 6 through 13. Illustrated are the most and least important and the extent of use of various job elements.

## Information Input

Division one, Information Input, contains two subdivisions, sources of information and activities for completion of the job. In the first subdivision, department store apparel buyers were asked to evaluate the extent of use of nine sources of information in performing their job (Table 6). In the second division, six activities were evaluated as being important to the buyer's job (Table 7).

## Sources of Information

Among all information sources, inventory was the most extensively used source by apparel buyers of department stores in all sales volume categories and the composite of all buyers. Quantitative materials were less extensively used by buyers of stores with annual sales under $\$ 300$ million than any other source. Resident buying offices were the least extensively used source by buyers of large department stores with an annual sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus. Art and decor was the least extensively used source
by the composite of all buyers and buyers from medium-sized department stores with annual sale volumes between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.

Table 6
Information Input: The Extent of Use of Information Sources by Buyers of Stores in Different Sales Volume Categories


Job Completion Activities
Activities for the completion of the job in the second subdivision of Information Input, included six job elements. The importance of each job element estimated by buyers of stores in three sales volume categories and the composite of all buyers is presented in Table 7. Regardless of their
stores' annual sales volume, the buyers perceived judging condition or quality as the most important activity and estimating size as the least important activity in performing their job.

Table 7
Y
Information Input: The Importance of Activities for Completion of Job to Buyers of Stores in Different Sales Volume Categories

| INFORMATION INPUT: <br> activities for completion of job | UNDER \$300 MILLION | $\$ 300$ MILLION <br> -\$1 BILLION | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1 \text { BILLION } \\ & \text { PLUS } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN <br> (SD) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | MEAN <br> (SD) |
| Color Perception | 3.81 | 3.57 | 3.65 | 3.70 |
|  | (0.94) | (0.95) | (0.90) | (0.91) |
| Judging Condition or Quality | 4.56 | 4.21 | 4.37 | 4.41 |
|  | (0.50) | (0.88) | (0.78) | (0.74) |
| Inspecting Workmanship | 3.93 | 3.85 | 3.61 | 3.80 |
|  | (1.03) | (0.93) | (1.21) | (1.07) |
| Estimating Quantity | 3.00 | 3.30 | 3.87 | 3.49 |
|  | (1.83) | (1.90) | (1.29) | (1.66) |
| Estimating Size | 2.71 | 2.09 | 2.07 | 2.29 |
|  | (1.55) | (1.70) | (1.51) | (1.60) |
| Estimating Time | 3.31 | 3.55 | 3.65 | 3.47 |
|  | (1.48) | (1.40) | (1.29) | (1.40) |

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Note. } 0 \text {-Does not Apply } & \text { 1-Very Minor } & \text { 2-Low Importance } \\ \text { 3-Average Importance } & \text { 4-High Importance } & \text { 5-Extreme High Importance }\end{array}$

## Mental Processes

Division two, Mental Processes, is composed of six job elements. All elements of mental processes were evaluated as being important to the buyer's job (Table 8).

Decision making was considered as the most important mental process by the composite of all buyers and the buyers of small department stores with an annual sales volume under
\$300 million. Large department store buyers placed more importance on two job elements, decision making and reasoning in problem solving, than other job elements. Reasoning in problem solving was rated as the most important element by buyers of the stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.

Table 8
Mental Processes: The Importance of Processing Information to Buyers of Stores in Different Sales Volume Categories

|  | UNDER \$300 MILLION | $\$ 300$ MILLION -\$1 BILLION | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1 \text { BILLION } \\ & \text { PIUS } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MENTAL PROCESSES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Decision Making | $\begin{gathered} 4.71 \\ (0.46) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.66 \\ (0.52) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.68 \\ (0.53) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.68 \\ (0.51) \end{gathered}$ |
| Reasoning Problem Solving | $\begin{gathered} 4.58 \\ (0.56) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.68 \\ (0.52) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.68 \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.65 \\ (0.52) \end{gathered}$ |
| Planning \& Scheduling | $\begin{gathered} 3.95 \\ (0.82) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.19 \\ (0.82) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.31 \\ (0.65) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.15 \\ (0.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| Combining Information | $\begin{gathered} 4.07 \\ (1.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.38 \\ (0.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.45 \\ (0.69) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.30 \\ (0.86) \end{gathered}$ |
| Compiling Information | $\begin{gathered} 4.00 \\ (0.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.26 \\ (0.87) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.11 \\ (0.78) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.12 \\ (0.84) \end{gathered}$ |
| Analyzing Information Data | $\begin{gathered} 4.29 \\ (0.89) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.66 \\ (0.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.46 \\ (0.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.45 \\ (0.73) \end{gathered}$ |

Note. \begin{tabular}{l}
0-Does not Apply <br>
3-Average Importance

 

1-Very Minor <br>
4-High Importance

$\quad$

2-Low Importance <br>
5 -Extreme High Importance
\end{tabular}

Compiling information was least important to the
$\$ 300$ million and stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.

Work output
Work Output, the third division, included devices and activities and their importance to the buyer's job (Table 9). Regardless of a department store's annual sales volume, keyboard devices were the most important job element and arranging/positioning was least important to buyers.

Table 9
Work Output: The Importance of Devices and Activities to Buyers of Stores in Different Sales Volume categories

|  | UNDER $\$ 300$ MILLION | $\$ 300$ MILLION -\$1 BILLION | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1 \text { BILLION } \\ & \text { PLUS } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEVICES OR ACTIVITY OF Job | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Keyboard Devices | $\begin{gathered} 4.46 \\ (0.75) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.67 \\ (0.60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.33 \\ (1.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.47 \\ (0.86) \end{gathered}$ |
| Arranging/Positioning | $\begin{gathered} 2.90 \\ (1.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.28 \\ (1.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.43 \\ (1.37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.12 \\ (1.52) \end{gathered}$ |

Note. $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 0-Does not Apply } & \text { 1-Very Minor } \\ \text { 3-Average Importance } & \text { 4-High Importance }\end{array} \quad \begin{aligned} & \text { 2-Low Importance } \\ & \text { 5-Extreme High Importance }\end{aligned}$

Relationships with Other Persons
The forth division, Relationships with Other Persons,
contained two subdivisions, job-related personal contacts and types of communication. In the first subdivision department store apparel buyers were asked to evaluate the importance of 11 job-related personal contacts to them in
performing their job (Table 10). In the second subdivision nine types of communication were evaluated as being important to the buyer's job (Table 11).

## Job-related Personal Contacts

Contacts with supervisors was most important to the buyers of small department stores with an annual sales volume under $\$ 300$ million. Contacts with middle management/staff personnel was most important to buyers of large department stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus and medium-sized stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion. The composite of all buyers, also, perceived contacts with middle management/staff personnel as the most important job-related personal contact.

Contacts with professional personnel was the least important job-related personal contact to buyers of all three sizes of department stores. The composite of all buyers, also, considered contacts with professional personnel as the most important contacts.

## Types of Communication

In second subdivision, types of communication, negotiating was the most important job element to buyers of department stores in all sales volume categories. The mean
score of the composite of all buyers indicates that negotiating was most important.

Table 10
Relationship with Other Persons: The Importance of JobRelated Personal Contacts to Buyers of Stores in Different Sales Volume Categories

|  | UNDER \$300 MILLION | $\$ 300$ MILLION <br> - $\$ 1$ BILLION | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1 \text { BILLION } \\ & \text { PLUS } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PERSONS: JOB-RELATED PERSONAL CONTACTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Executives | 3.36 | 3.57 | 3.74 | 3.56 |
|  | (0.94) | (0.99) | (0.85) | (0.95) |
| Middle Management/Staff Personnel | 3.86 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.06 |
|  | (0.97) | (0.80) | (0.76) | (0.89) |
| Supervisors | 4.19 | 4.04 | 3.68 | 3.93 |
|  | (0.83) | (0.83) | (1.06) | (1.00) |
| Professional Personnel | 0.95 | 0.68 | 0.84 | 0.82 |
|  | (1.15) | (0.98) | (0.94) | (1.04) |
| Semiprofessional Personnel | 1.88 | 1.83 | 2.45 | 2.06 |
|  | (1.23) | (1.19) | (1.18) | (1.25) |
| Clerical Personnel | 3.39 | 3.47 | 3.44 | 3.39 |
|  | (1.20) | (1.16) | (1.14) | (1.19) |
| Manual and Service Workers | 1.64 | 1.66 | 1.23 | 1.48 |
|  | (1.24) | (1.27) | (1.24) | (1.26) |
| Sales Personnel | 4.10 | 3.50 | 3.17 | 3.58 |
|  | (0.88) | (0.81) | (1.25) | (1.09) |
| Buyers | 3.92 | 3.94 | 3.91 | 3.88 |
|  | (1.24) | (0.79) | (1.38) | (1.21) |
| Customers | 3.51 | 3.23 | 2.86 | 3.16 |
|  | (1.36) | (1.29) | (1.60) | (1.44) |
| Students, Interns, and Trainees | $1.76$ | $2.19$ | $1.96$ | $1.91$ |
|  | $(1.36)$ | (1.31) | $(1.39)$ | (1.35) |
| Note. 0-Does not Apply 1 -very <br> 3-Average Importance 4 -High | nor | Low Importance |  |  |
|  | ortance | 5-Extreme High Importance |  |  |

Public speaking was perceived as the least important type of communication by buyers of stores of all three sales volume categories. Mean scores of the composite of all
buyers indicate that public speaking was least important.

Table 11
Relationships with Other Persons: The Importance of Types of Communication to Buyers of Stores in Different Sales Volume categories

| RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER PERSONS: tYPES OF COMMUNICATION | UNDER \$300 MILLION | $\$ 300$ MILLION <br> -\$1 BILLION | \$1 BILLION PLUS | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Advising | 3.16 | 3.32 | 3.59 | 3.35 |
|  | (1.15) | (1.14) | (0.95) | (1.09) |
| Negotiating | 4.44 | 4.66 | 4.80 | 4.63 |
|  | (0.70) | (0.60) | (0.40) | (0.59) |
| Persuading | 3.85 | 4.30 | 4.41 | 4.18 |
|  | (0.69) | (0.83) | (0.69) | (0.76) |
| Instructing | 3.37 | 3.68 | 3.59 | 3.54 |
|  | (1.03) | (0.78) | (0.92) | (0.92) |
| Interviewing | $1.90$ | 2.06 | 2.20 | $2.07$ |
|  | $(1.31)$ | (1.05) | (1.14) | $(1.18)$ |
| Routine Information Exchange | $3.39$ | 3.64 | 3.63 | 3.54 |
|  | $(1.14)$ | (0.99) | (0.93) | (1.03) |
| Nonroutine Information Exchange | $2.37$ | 2.28 | 2.44 | 2.34 |
|  | (1.11) | (1.31) | (1.12) | (1.16) |
| Writing/Composing | $2.46$ | $2.83$ | $2.94$ | $2.70$ |
|  | (1.13) | (1.17) | (1.18) | (1.20) |
| Public Speaking | $1.86$ | $1.64$ | 2.23 | $1.92$ |
|  | (1.18) | (1.41) | (1.46) | $(1.36)$ |

Note. 0-Does not Apply 2-Very Minor 2-Low Importance
3-Average Importance 4-High Importance 5-Extreme High Importance

## Job Context

Job Context, the fifth division, concerns work situation and environment. Buyers rated the importance of five elements within the division (Table 12).

Buyers of stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ and $\$ 1$ billion placed more importance on frustrating situation than any other job element. However, personal sacrifice was considered as most important by buyers of small department stores with a sales volume under $\$ 300$
million and large stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus. The mean score of the composite of all buyers, also, indicates that personal sacrifice was most important.

Civic obligation was the least important type of communication to buyers of department stores in all three sales volume categories. The mean score of the composite of all buyers, also, shows that civic obligation was least important.

Table 12
Job Context: The Importance of Work Situation and Environment to Buyers of Stores in Different Sales Volume Categories

|  | UNDER \$300 MILLION | \$300 MILLION -\$1 BILLION | \$1 BILLION PLUS | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JOB CONTEXT: WORK SITUATION AND ENVIRONMENT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Civic Obligation | $\begin{gathered} 1.16 \\ (1.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.81 \\ (1.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.40 \\ (1.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.15 \\ (1.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Frustration Situation | $\begin{gathered} 3.16 \\ (1.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.38 \\ (1.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.39 \\ (1.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.29 \\ (1.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Strained Personal Contacts | $\begin{gathered} 2.40 \\ (1.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.83 \\ (1.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.90 \\ (0.92) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.68 \\ (1.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Personal Sacrifice | $\begin{gathered} 3.31 \\ (1.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.34 \\ (1.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.54 \\ (1.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.38 \\ (1.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Interpersonal Conflict Situations | $\begin{gathered} 2.22 \\ (1.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.74 \\ (1.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.83 \\ (1.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.55 \\ (1.30) \end{gathered}$ |

Note. 0-Does not Apply 1-Very Minor 2-Low Importance
3-Average Importance
4-High Importance
5-Extreme High Importance

## Other Job Characteristics

The last division, Other Job Characteristics, concerns miscellaneous items such as work schedules, job demands, and
various job responsibilities. Seven job elements were compared as being important to the buyer's job (Table 13).

Working under distractions was most important to buyers of department stores in all three sales volume categories. The mean score of the composite of all buyers, also, indicates that working under distractions was most important.

Special talent was least important to buyers of department stores in all three sales volume categories. The mean score of the composite of all buyers, also, indicates that special talent was least important.

Table 13
Other Job Characteristics: The Importance of Demands of the Job to Buyers of Stores in Different Sales Volume Categories

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { UNDER \$300 } \\ \text { MILLION } \end{gathered}$ | \$300 MILLION <br> -\$1 BILLION | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1 \text { BILLION } \\ & \text { PLUS } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OTHER JOB CHARACTERISTICS: demands on the job | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Following Set Procedures | $\begin{gathered} 3.59 \\ (0.89) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.63 \\ (0.77) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.51 \\ (0.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.56 \\ (0.90) \end{gathered}$ |
| Time Pressure | $\begin{gathered} 4.12 \\ (0.87) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.50 \\ (0.66) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.44 \\ (0.61) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.36 \\ (0.72) \end{gathered}$ |
| Precision | $\begin{gathered} 4.36 \\ (0.61) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.43 \\ (0.62) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.36 \\ (0.64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.41 \\ (0.62) \end{gathered}$ |
| Attention to Detail | $\begin{gathered} 4.47 \\ (0.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.59 \\ (0.58) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.53 \\ (0.61) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.53 \\ (0.58) \end{gathered}$ |
| Working Under Distractions | $\begin{gathered} 4.64 \\ (0.58) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.72 \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.70 \\ (0.49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.69 \\ (0.52) \end{gathered}$ |
| Updating Job Knowledge | $\begin{gathered} 4.20 \\ (0.69) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.96 \\ (0.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.97 \\ (0.87) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.06 \\ & (0.78) \end{aligned}$ |
| Special Talent | $\begin{gathered} 3.05 \\ (1.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.87 \\ (1.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.60 \\ (1.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.82 \\ (1.10) \end{gathered}$ |

## Miscellaneous Job Requirements

Other job requirements and responsibilities were compared as being important to the buyer's job (Table 14). These elements are not compared within the six PAQ divisions as just discussed because some scales that do not fit the buyer's job characteristics were eliminated. Buyers were asked to estimate the following requirements and responsibilities: the amount of time needed for business travel, the number of persons under their supervision, the level of physical exertion required, immediate supervision received, and the highest level of mathematics needed.

## Travel Required

Buyers of stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus placed the higher ratings in the proportion of time required to travel (usually overnight and away from their residence) than buyer of stores in any other sales volume categories and the composite of all buyers. A lower amount of travel time required was estimated by buyers in stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion than by buyers of stores in any other sales volume category and the composite of all buyers.

## Workers Supervised

More workers were under the supervision of buyers of large department stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion
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plus than buyers of stores in any other sales volume category and the composite of all buyers. Buyers of mediumsized department stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and \$1 billion had fewer workers under their supervision than buyers of stores in any other sales volume category and the composite of all buyers.


## Immediate Supervision Received

The least immediate supervision was given to buyers of small department stores with a sales volume under \$300 million. Buyers of medium-sized department stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion received more immediate supervision than buyers of stores in any other sales volume category and the composite of all buyers.

## Physical Exertion

In terms of the level of physical exertion required, buyers of small department stores with a sales volume under $\$ 300$ million estimated the highest level among buyers in all sales volume categories. Buyers in medium-sized department stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion perceived the lowest level of physical exertion.

## Mathematics Knowledge

Concerning the highest level of mathematics needed to perform the buyer's job, buyers of large department stores
with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus perceived a higher level of mathematics needed than buyers of stores in any other sales volume category. The lowest level of mathematics was stated as needed by buyers of stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.

Table 14
Miscellaneous Job Requirements: The Importance of Other Job Responsibilities and Requirements by Buyers of Stores in Different Sales Volume Categories

| OTHER JOB RESPONSIBILITIES AND REQUIREMENTS | UNDER \$300 MILLION | \$300 MILLION -\$1 BILLION | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1 \text { BILLION } \\ & \text { PLUS } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN } \\ & \text { (SD) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Travel <br> ( 0 -does not apply 1 -under $1 / 10$ of time 2-1/10 to $2 / 3$ of time 3-1/3 to $2 / 3$ of time 4 -over $2 / 3$ of time 5- almost continuous(y) | $\begin{gathered} 2.20 \\ (0.83) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.00 \\ (1.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.31 \\ (0.96) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.17 \\ (0.95) \end{gathered}$ |
| Supervision <br> (1-none 2-1 or 2 workers 3-3 to 5 4-6 or more) | $\begin{gathered} 2.32 \\ (0.75) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.04 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.55 \\ (0.65) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 . .32 \\ (0.63) \end{array}$ |
| Supervision Received <br> (1-immediate supervision 2-general supervision 3-general direction 4-nominal direction 5-no supervision) | $\begin{gathered} 3.07 \\ (1.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.81 \\ (1.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.96 \\ (1.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.96 \\ (1.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| Physical Exertion (1-very light 2-light 3-moderate 4-heavy 5-very heavy) | $\begin{gathered} 2.15 \\ (0.93) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.93 \\ (0.91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.82 \\ (0.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.95 \\ (0.95) \end{gathered}$ |
| Math <br> (1-does not apply 2-basic 3-intermediate 4-advanced 5-very advanced) | $\begin{gathered} 3.10 \\ (0.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.09 \\ (0.54) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.18 \\ (0.49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.13 \\ & (0.50) \end{aligned}$ |

## Summary of Job Elements

Table 15, a composite of all buyer categories, provides a summary of the importance/extent of use of the 55 job elements from the six divisions of the PAQ. It also provides a basis form comparing the three categories: (a) buyers of stores with an annual sales volume of under $\$ 300$ million (Table 16), (b) buyers of stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion (Table 17), and (c) buyers of stores with an annual sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus (Table 18).

Table 15
Most and Least Important/Extensively Used Job Elements: A Composite of All Buyers

| PAQ DIVISION | MOST IMPORTANT/ <br> EXTENSIVELY USED <br> (MEAN SCORE) | LEAST IMPORTANT/ <br> EXTENSIVELY USED <br> (MEAN SCORE) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I.Information Input <br> Information Sources <br> Activities for Completion of Job | Inventory <br> Judging Condition or <br> Quality | Arts \& Decor <br> Estimating Size |
| II. Mental Processes | Decision Making <br> III. Work Output | Keyboard Devices <br> IV. Relationship with Other Persons <br> Job-Related Personal Contacts |
| Types of Communication | Middle Management/Staff <br> Personnel | Professional Personnel |

The first store category, stores with an annual sales volume under $\$ 300$ million, is covered in Table 16. When compared with the composite, the most noteworthy difference was in quantitative materials in Information Input, and planning and scheduling in Mental Processes where least value was placed. While the composite of all buyers identified contacts with middle management/staff personnel as the most important personal contacts, contacts with supervisors were most important to buyers of small department stores with a sale volume under $\$ 300$ million.

Table 16
Most and Least Important/Extensively Used Job Elements: Stores with an Annual Sales Volume Under $\$ 300$ Million

| PAQ DIVISION | MOST IMPORTANT/ <br> EXTENSIVELY USED <br> (MEAN SCORE) | LEAST IMPORTANT/ <br> EXTENSIVELY USED <br> (MEAN SCORE) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I.Information Input <br> Information Sources <br> Activities for Completion of Job | Inventory <br> Judging Condition or <br> Quality | Quantitative Materials <br> Estimating Size |
| II. Mental Processes | Decision Making <br> III. Work Output | Keyboard Devices |
| IV. Relationship with Other Persons |  |  |
| Job-Related Personal Contacts |  |  |
| Types of Communication |  |  |$\quad$| Supervisors |
| :--- |
| Negotiating |

The second store category, stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion, is presented in Table 17. When compared with the composite, the difference was in Mental Processes, where less importance was placed on planning and scheduling. In Job Context, the buyers in this category perceived frustrating situations as the more important job element than the composite of all buyers.

Table 17
Most and Least Important/Extensively Used Job Elements: Stores with an Annual Sales Volume Between $\$ 300$ Million and $\$ 1$ Billion

| PAQ DIVISION | MOST IMPORTANT/ EXTENSIVELY USED (MEAN SCORE) | LEAST IMPORTANT/ EXTENSIVELY USED (MEAN SCORE) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Information Input Information Sources Activities for Completion of Job | Inventory Judging Condition or Quality | Arts \& Decor Estimating Size |
| II. Mental Processes | Reasoning in Problem Solving | Planning Scheduling |
| III. Work Output | Keyboard Devices | Arranging/Positioning |
| IV. Relationship with Other Persons Job-Related Personal Contacts Types of Communication | Middle Management/Staff Personnel Negotiating | Professional Personnel <br> Public Speaking |
| V. Job Context | Frustrating Situations | Civic Obligations |
| VI. Other Job Characteristics | Working Under Distractions | Special Talent |

The stores with an annual sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plús closely paralleled the most important/extensively used and the least important/extensively used results in the
composite of all buyers categories (Table 18). The buyers of this category identified resident buying offices, in the division of Information Input, less importantly than the composite of all buyers. These buyers perceived two job elements in the Mental Processes division, decision making and reasoning in problem solving, as most important when compared with the composite of all buyers.

Table 18
Most and Least Important/Extensively Used Job Element: Stores with an Annual Sales Volume of $\$ 1$ Billion Plus

| PAQ DIVISION | MOST IMPORTANT/ <br> EXTENSIVELY USED <br> (MEAN SCORE) | LEAST IMPORTANT/ <br> EXTENSIVELY USED <br> (MEAN SCORE) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I.Information Input <br> Information Sources <br> Activities for Completion of Job | Inventory <br> Judging Condition or <br> Quality | Resident Buying Offices <br> Estimating Size |
| II. Mental Processes | Decision Making <br> Reasoning in Problem <br> Solving | Compiling Information |
| III. Work Output | Keyboard Devices | Arranging/Positioning |
| IV. Relationship with Other Persons |  |  |
| Job-Related Personal Contacts | Middle Management/Staff <br> Personnel | Professional Personnel |

Hypothesized Findings
The six hypotheses for 55 job elements in the following six divisions of the PAQ were examined in this study:
information input, mental processes, work output, relationships with other persons, job context, and other job characteristics. Buyer's responses to 55 job elements in the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) were compared using Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) according to company's size measured by annual dollar sales volume. Stores were categorized as follows: (a) under $\$ 300$ million, (b) between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion, and (c) $\$ 1$ billion plus. The . 001 level of significance was chosen because of the probability of type 1 error when a large number (55) of tests are conducted. All hypotheses indicated that there were four significant differences in buyer responses as a result of annual sales volume.

## Comparison of Buyer's Response to Information Input by Company's Annual Sales Volume Categories

$\mathrm{H}_{0} 1$. There is no significant difference in information input responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.

Hypothesis 1 examined buyers' responses to the Information Input questions related to different annual sales volume categories. The first division of the PAQ, Information Input, consists of sources of information and activities for completion of the job.

Table 19 shows the results of the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) for Hypothesis 1 . This is a measure of
whether groups differ significantly in scores of responses to sources of information. The results of the overall MANOVA test were Wilk's Lambda $=.65, \underline{F}=4.37$, and p < . 0001. This was significant.

Table 19 indicates that there were significant differences at the $\mathrm{p}<.0001$ level in the extent of use of two information sources: events and resident buying offices. On the other hand, there were no significant differences in other information sources. When grouped according to company's annual sales volume, department store buyers do not use the following information sources more extensively: written materials, quantitative materials, pictorial materials, inventory, consumer behavior, arts and decor, and verbal sources.

The post hoc test results are presented in Table 20. Scheffe for unequal sample sizes was used to find in which groups of buyers the differences were located in the extent of use of events and resident buying offices variables.

Table 20 indicates that buyers for stores with a sales volume under $\$ 300$ million more extensively used events as an information source than buyers for stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus and buyers for stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion. Resident buying offices are less extensively used by buyers for stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus than buyers for stores
with a sales volume of under $\$ 300$ million and buyers for stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.

Table 19
MANOVA on Responses in Information Input: Sources of Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EFFECTS | SS | MS | F | Q |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ANNUAL SALES VOLUME |  |  |  |  |
| Written Materials | 4.72 | 2.36 | 1.90 | 0.1534 |
| Quantitative Materials | 15.90 | 7.95 | 3.41 | 0.0352 |
| Pictorial Materials | 7.14 | 3.57 | 2.78 | 0.0647 |
| Inventory | 3.37 | 1.69 | 3.88 | 0.0225 |
| Consumer Behavior | 9.60 | 4.80 | 2.76 | 0.0662 |
| Events | 24.26 | 12.13 | 10.70 | $<.0001 *$ |
| Arts and Decor | 10.73 | 5.36 | 3.30 | 0.0391 |
| Verbal Resources | 4.80 | 2.40 | 2.70 | 0.0703 |
| Resident Buying Office | 59.45 | 29.73 | 11.93 | $<.0001 *$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ERROR |  |  |  |  |
| Hritten Materials | 211.42 | 1.24 |  |  |
| Quantitative Materials | 396.04 | 2.33 |  |  |
| Picterial Materials | 218.05 | 1.28 |  |  |
| Inventory | 73.82 | 0.43 |  |  |
| Consumer Behavior | 295.65 | 1.74 |  |  |
| Events | 192.79 | 1.13 |  |  |
| Arts and Decor | 276.00 | 1.62 |  |  |
| Verbal Resources | 151.29 | 0.89 |  |  |
| Resident Buying Office | 423.63 | 2.49 |  |  |

Note. $\mathrm{df}=2,170$

Table 21 shows the results of the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) for Hypothesis 1. This is a measure of whether groups differ significantly in scores of responses to activities for completion of job. The results of the
overall MANOVA test were Wilk's Lambda $=.82, \underline{F}=2.93$, and $\mathrm{p}=.0007$. This was significant.

Table 20
Scheffe Post Hoc Tests in the Extent of Use of Events and Resident Buying Office as Information Sources by Buyers of Stores with Different Annual Sales Volume

| VARIABLE | MEANS COMPARED | MEANS DIFFERENCE | SIGN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $(1,2)$ | 0.842 | $* *$ |
|  | $(1,3)$ | 0.758 | $* *$ |
| Resident Buying Office | $(2,3)$ | -0.085 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $(1,2)$ | 0.083 | $* *$ |
|  | $(1,3)$ | 1.226 | $* *$ |

Note. * p < . 05
** $\mathrm{p}<.01$
Group $1=$ Stores with a sale volume of under $\$ 300 \mathrm{million}$
Group $2=$ Stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300 \mathrm{million} \$ 1$ billion Group $3=$ Stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus

SSR (Scheffe Contrast) $=.58$ for tests of event
SSR (Scheffe Contrast) $=. .86$ for tests of resident buying offices

Table 21 indicates that there was no significant difference in importance of the following activities for completion of job among apparel buyers with different annual sales volume categories: color perception, judging condition or quality, inspecting workmanship, estimating quantity, estimating size, and estimating time.

Table 21
MANOVA ON Responses in Information Input: Activities for Completion of Job

| EFFECTS | $\underline{\text { SS }}$ | $\underline{\text { MS }}$ | $\underline{E}$ | $\underline{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

annual sales volume

| Color Perception | 1.33 | 0.66 | 0.79 | 0.4569 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Judging Condition or Quality | 2.77 | 1.38 | 2.62 | 0.0757 |
| Inspecting Horkmanship | 4.08 | 2.04 | 1.75 | 0.1762 |
| Estimating Quantity | 25.58 | 12.79 | 4.69 | 0.0104 |
| Estimating Size | 15.07 | 7.54 | 3.05 | 0.0501 |
| Estimating Time | 4.24 | 2.12 | 1.13 | 0.3260 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Color Perception | 146.10 | 0.85 |  |  |
| Judging Condition or Quality | 91.39 | 0.53 |  |  |
| Inspecting Workmanship | 201.14 | 1.16 |  |  |
| Estimating Quantity | 471.59 | 2.73 |  |  |
| Estimating Size | 427.97 | 2.47 |  |  |
| Estimating Time | 325.66 | 1.88 |  |  |

Note. $d f=2,173$
$\frac{\text { Comparison of Buyer's Response to Mental Processes }}{\text { by Company's Annual Sales Volume Categories }}$
$\mathrm{H}_{0} 2$. There is no significant difference in mental
processes responses among apparel buyers of
department stores with different annual sales volume
categories.

Hypothesis 2 examined buyers' responses to the Mental
Processes questions related to different annual sales volume categories. Table 22 shows the results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) for Hypothesis 2. This is a measure of whether groups differ significantly in scores of responses to Mental Processes. The results of the overall

MANOVA test were Wilk's Lambda $=.90, \underline{F}=1.54$, and

```
p = .1086. Table 22 indicates that there is no significant
difference in the following Mental Processes responses among
apparel buyers of department stores with different annual
sales volume categories: decision making, reasoning in
problem solving, planning and scheduling, combining
information, compiling information, and analyzing
information or data.
```

Table 22
MANOVA ON Responses in Mental Processes
EFFECTS $\underline{\mathbf{S S}} \quad \underline{M S} \quad \underline{E} \quad \underline{p}$
annual sales volume

| Decision Making | 0.08 | 0.39 | 0.15 | 0.8573 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reasoning in Problem Solving | 0.41 | 0.20 | 0.74 | 0.4806 |
| Planning \& Scheduling | 4.26 | 2.13 | 3.74 | 0.0258 |
| Combining Information | 5.11 | 2.56 | 3.76 | 0.0253 |
| Compiling Information | 1.71 | 0.85 | 1.24 | 0.2931 |
| Analyzing Information or Data | 3.62 | 1.81 | 3.41 | 0.0354 |

ERROR

| Decision Making | 44.20 | 0.25 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Reasoning in Problem Solving | 48.17 | 0.28 |
| Planning \& Scheduling | 99.31 | 0.57 |
| Combining Information | 118.41 | 0.68 |
| Compiling Information | 120.03 | 0.69 |
| Analyzing Information or Data | 92.32 | 0.53 |

Note. $\mathrm{df}=2,174$

## Comparison of Buyer's Response to Work Output by Company's Annual Sales Volume Categories

$\mathrm{H}_{0} 3$. There is no significant difference in work output responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.

Hypothesis 3 examined buyers' responses to work Output related to different annual sales volume categories. Table 23 shows the results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) for Hypothesis 3. This is measure of whether groups differ significantly in scores of responses to Work Output. The results of the overall MANOVA test were Wilk's Lambda $=.81, \mathrm{~F}=9.79$, and $\mathrm{p}<.0001$. This was significant.

Table 23 indicates that there was no significant difference in the importance of use of keyboard devices among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories. However, there was a significant difference, at the p < . 0001 level, in the importance of arranging/positioning among buyers of stores with different sales volume.

Table 23
MANOVA ON Responses in Work Output: Devices and Activities

| Effects | SS | MS | E | [ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| annual sales volume |  |  |  |  |
| Keyboard Devices Arranging/Positioning | $\begin{array}{r} 3.31 \\ 70.27 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.66 \\ 35.14 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.22 \\ 18.78 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1114 \\ & <.0001 \text { * } \end{aligned}$ |
| ERROR |  |  |  |  |
| Keyboard Devices Arranging/Positioning | $\begin{aligned} & 128.20 \\ & 321.86 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.75 \\ & 1.87 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

Note. $\mathrm{df}=2,172$

The Post hoc test, Scheffe for unequal sample sizes, was conducted to find which groups of buyers made the difference in the importance of arranging/positioning. Table 24 indicates that buyers of stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus placed significantly lower ratings in the importance of arranging/positioning as work output than buyers of stores with a sales volume under $\$ 300$ million. Buyers of large department stores, also, perceived this job element less importantly than buyers of stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.

Table 24
Scheffe Post Hoc Test in the Importance of Arranging/Positioning to Buyers of Stores with Different Annual Sales Volume

| VARIABLE | MEANS COMPARED | MEANS DIFFERENCE | SIGN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Arranging/Positioning | $(1,2)$ | 0.616 |  |
|  | $(1,3)$ | 0.854 |  |

Note. * $\mathrm{p}<.5 \quad * * p<.01$
SSR (Scheffe Contrast) $=0.74$
Group $1=$ Stores with a sale volume of under $\$ 300$ million
Group $2=$ Stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million $\$ 1$ billion
Group $3=$ Stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus.

## Comparison of Buyer's Response to Relationships with Other Persons by Company's Annual Sales Volume Categories

$\mathrm{H}_{0} 4$. There is no significant difference in relationships with other persons responses among apparel buyers of
department stores with different annual sales volume categories.

Hypothesis 4 examined buyers' responses to
Relationships with Other Persons related to different annual sales volume categories. The forth division of the PAQ, consists of two subdivisions: job-related personal contacts and types of communication.

Table 25 shows the results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) test of significance, which is a measure of whether groups differ significantly in scores of responses to job-related personal contacts. The results of the overall MANOVA test were Wilk's Lambda $=.67, \underline{F}=3.20$, and $\mathrm{p}<.0001$. This was significant.

Table 25 indicates that there was a significant difference, at the $p<.0001$ level, in the importance of contacts with sales personnel. On the other hand, there was no significant difference in other personal contacts: executives, middle management/staff personnel, supervisors, professional personnel, semiprofessional personnel, clerical personnel, manual and service workers, buyers, customers, and student, interns, and trainees.

The Post hoc test, Scheffe for unequal sample sizes, was conducted to find which groups of buyers made the difference in the importance of job-related personal contact
with sales personnel. Table 26 indicates that buyers of stores with a sales volume under $\$ 300$ million placed significantly higher ratings in the importance of contacts with sales personnel than buyers of stores with a sale volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus and with a sales volume between \$300 million and $\$ 1$ billion.

Table 25
MANOVA ON Responses in Relationships with Other Persons: Job Related Personal Contacts

| EFFECTS | SS | $\underline{\text { MS }}$ | $\underline{F}$ | $\mathbf{p}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

ANNUAL SALES VOLUME

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Executives | 5.51 | 2.75 | 3.31 | 0.0390 |
| Middle Management/Staff Personnel | 4.79 | 2.39 | 3.35 | 0.0375 |
| Supervisors | 9.01 | 4.50 | 5.20 | 0.0064 |
| Professional Personnel | 2.18 | 1.09 | 1.04 | 0.3546 |
| Semiprofessional Personnel | 16.28 | 8.14 | 5.69 | 0.0042 |
| Clerical Personnel | 0.25 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.9145 |
| Manual and Service Workers | 8.16 | 4.08 | 2.71 | 0.0695 |
| Sales Personnel | 28.52 | 14.26 | 13.34 | $<.0001$ * |
| Buyers | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.9452 |
| Customers | 12.97 | 6.49 | 3.11 | 0.0472 |
| Students, Interns, \& Trainees | 5.83 | 2.92 | 1.59 | 0.2072 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Executives | 138.09 | 0.83 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Middle Management/Staff Personnel | 118.62 | 0.71 |
| Supervisors | 143.70 | 0.87 |
| Professional Personnel | 173.18 | 1.04 |
| Semiprofessional Personnel | 238.56 | 1.44 |
| Clerical Personnel | 229.35 | 1.38 |
| Manual and Service Workers | 249.76 | 1.50 |
| Sales Personnel | 177.48 | 1.07 |
| Buyers | 241.50 | 1.45 |
| Customers | 346.33 | 2.09 |
| Students, Interns, \& Trainees | 304.69 | 1.84 |

Table 27 shows the results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) test of significance, which is a measure of whether groups differ significantly in scores of responses to types of communication. The results of the overall MANOVA test were Wilk's Lambda $=.82, \underline{F}=1.98$, and $\mathrm{p}=.0104$. Table 27 indicates that there was no significant difference in importance of the following types of communication among apparel buyers with different annual sales volume categories: advising, negotiating, persuading, instructing, interviewing, routine information exchange, nonroutine information exchange, writing/composing, and public speaking.

Table 26

Scheffe Post Hoc Test in the Importance of Arranging/Positioning by Buyers of Stores with Different Annual Sales Volume

| VARIABLE | MEANS COMPARED | MEANS DIFFERENCE | SIGN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Contacts with Sales | $(1,2)$ | 0.570 | $* *$ |
| Personnel | $(1,3)$ | 0.964 | $* *$ |
|  | $(2,3)$ | 0.394 |  |

```
Note. * p < . 05
    ** p < . 01
    SSR (SCheffe Contrast) = 0.74
    Group 1 = Stores with a sale volume of under $300 million
    Group 2 = Stores with a sales volume between $300 million $1 billion
    Group 3= Stores with a sales volume of $1 billion plus.
```

Table 27
MANOVA ON Response in Relationships with Other Persons: Types of communication

| EFFECTS | SS | MS | F | $\underline{\square}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANNUAL SALES VOLUME |  |  |  |  |
| Advising | 6.95 | 3.47 | 3.04 | 0.0503 |
| Negotiating | 4.67 | 2.34 | 7.26 | 0.0009 |
| Persuading | 10.28 | 5.14 | 9.65 | 0.0001 |
| Instructing | 2.57 | 1.29 | 1.49 | 0.2288 |
| Interviewing | 2.66 | 1.33 | 0.95 | 0.3894 |
| Routine Information Exchange | 2.84 | 1.42 | 1.37 | 0.2577 |
| Nonroutine Information Exchange | 0.78 | 0.39 | 0.28 | 0.7557 |
| Writing/Composing | 7.40 | 3.70 | 2.74 | 0.0671 |
| Public Speaking | 10.28 | 5.14 | 2.79 | 0.0644 |
| ERROR |  |  |  |  |
| Advising | 196.40 | 1.14 |  |  |
| Negotiating | 55.36 | 0.32 |  |  |
| Persuading | 91.71 | 0.53 |  |  |
| Instructing | 148.85 | 0.87 |  |  |
| Interviewing | 240.77 | 1.40 |  |  |
| Routine Information Exchange | 178.59 | 1.04 |  |  |
| Nonroutine Information Exchange | 238.33 | 1.39 |  |  |
| Writing/Composing | 231.99 | 1.35 |  |  |
| Public Speaking | 317.35 | 1.85 |  |  |

Note. $\mathrm{df}=2,172$

Comparison of Buyer's Response to Job Context
by Company's Annual Sales Volume Categories
$\mathrm{H}_{0} 5$. There is no significant difference in job context responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.

Hypothesis 5 examined buyers' responses to Job
Context related to different annual sales volume categories.
Table 28 shows the results of Multivariate Analysis of
Variance (MANOVA) test of significance, which is a measure
of whether groups differ significantly in scores of
responses to Job Context. The results of the overall MANOVA test were Wilk's Lambda $=.89, \underline{F}=2.03$, and $\mathrm{p}=.0298$.

Table 28 indicates that there is no significant difference in the following work situations and environments of job context division among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories: civic obligations, frustrating situations, strained personal contacts, personal sacrifice, and interpersonal conflict situations.

## Table 28

MANOVA ON Response in Job Context: Work Situation and Environment

| EFFECTS | SS | MS | F | p |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANNUAL SALES VOLUME |  |  |  |  |
| Civic Obligation | 9.85 | 4.92 | 3.94 | 0.0212 |
| Frustrating Situation | 1.95 | 0.97 | 0.77 | 0.4653 |
| Strained Personal Contacts | 8.84 | 4.42 | 3.92 | 0.0216 |
| Personal Sacrifice | 2.13 | 1.07 | 0.89 | 0.4140 |
| Interpersonal Conflict Situation | 12.74 | 12.74 | 3.93 | 0.0214 |
| ERROR |  |  |  |  |
| Civic Obligation | 213.64 | 1.25 |  |  |
| Frustrating Situation | 216.64 | 1.27 |  |  |
| Strained Personal Contacts | 192.79 | 1.13 |  |  |
| Personal Sacrifice | 205.89 | 1.20 |  |  |
| Interpersonal Conflict Situation | 276.90 | 1.61 |  |  |

Comparison of Buyer's Response to Other Job Characteristics by Company's Annual Sales Volume Categories
$\mathrm{H}_{0} 6$. There is no significant difference in other job characteristics responses among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories.
Hypothesis 6 examined buyers' responses to Other Job Characteristics related to different annual sales volume categories. Table 29 shows the results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) for Hypothesis 6. This is a measure of whether groups differ significantly in scores of responses to Other Job Characteristics.
The results of the overall MANOVA test were Wilk's Lambda $=.88, \underline{F}=1.54$, and $\underline{p}=.0936$. Table 29 indicates that there is no significant difference in the importance of the following other job characteristics among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories: following set procedures, time pressure, precision, attention to detail, working under distractions, updating job knowledge, and special talent.

Table 29
MANOVA ON Responses in Other Job Characteristics: Job Demand

| EFFECTS | SS | MS | F | $\underline{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANNUAL SALES VOLUME |  |  |  |  |
| Following Set Procedure | 0.52 | 0.26 | 0.32 | 0.7269 |
| Time Pressure | 4.69 | 2.34 | 4.51 | 0.0124 |
| Precision | 0.24 | 0.12 | 0.31 | 0.7356 |
| Attention to Detail | 0.38 | 0.19 | 0.55 | 0.5761 |
| Working Under Distractions | 0.19 | 0.10 | 0.35 | 0.7075 |
| Updating Job Knowledge | 2.26 | 1.13 | 1.83 | 0.1631 |
| Special Talent | 8.10 | 4.05 | 3.58 | 0.0300 |
| ERROR |  |  |  |  |
| Following Set Procedure | 137.86 | 0.81 |  |  |
| Time Pressure | 88.93 | 0.52 |  |  |
| Precision | 66.48 | 0.39 |  |  |
| Attention to Detail | 59.03 | 0.35 |  |  |
| Working Under Distractions | 47.42 | 0.28 |  |  |
| Updating Job Knowledge | 105.37 | 0.61 |  |  |
| Special Talent | 193.40 | 1.13 |  |  |

Note. $\mathrm{df}=\mathbf{2 , 1 7 1}$

Summary of Results
Six null hypotheses were examined in the present study. The findings of the statistical analysis were the basis for rejecting or accepting the null hypotheses. The results of each of the hypothesis are summarized in Table 30. The significance level of . 001 was the criterion for rejecting or accepting the null hypotheses.
$H_{0}$ 1. There is no significant difference in information input responses among apparel buyers of department stores in three annual sales volume categories. REJECTED
$\mathrm{H}_{0}$ 2. There is no significant difference in mental processes responses among apparel buyers of department stores in three annual sales volume categories. FAILED TO REJECT
$\mathrm{H}_{0}$ 3. There is no significant difference in work output responses among apparel buyers of department stores in three annual sales volume categories. REJECTED
$H_{0}$ 4. There is no significant difference in relationships with other persons responses among apparel buyers of department stores in three annual sales volume categories. REJECTED
$H_{0}$ 5. There is no significant difference in job context responses among apparel buyers of department stores in three annual sales volume categories. FAILED TO REJECT
$\mathrm{H}_{0}$ 6. There is no significant difference in other job characteristics responses among apparel buyers of department stores in three annual sales volume categories. FAILED TO REJECT

## Table 30

## Summary of Null Hypotheses

| NULL HYPOTHESES | RESULTS |
| :--- | :--- | | DIFFERENCES |
| :---: |
| BETWEEN GROUPS |

$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{o}}$ 1. information input
Source of Information
Written Materials
Quantitative Materials
Pictorial Materials
Inventory
Consumer Behavior
Events
Art or Decor
Verbal Sources
Resident Buying Office

Activities for Completion of Job
Color Perception
Judging Condition or Quality
Inspecting Workmanship
Estimating Quantity
Estimating Size
Estimating Time
Failed to Reject
Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Rejected
$(1,2)(1,3)$
Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Rejected
$(1,3)(2,3)$

Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Failed to Reject
$H_{0}$ 2. MENTAL PROCESSES
Decision Making Reasoning in Problem Planning \& Scheduling Combining Information Compiling Information Analyzing Information or Data

Failed to Reject failed to Reject Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Failed to Reject Failed to Reject
$H_{0}$ 3. WORK OUTPUT

| Keyboard Devices | Failed to Reject |
| :--- | :--- |
| Arranging/positioning | Rejected |

[^0]Table 30 - Continued

## Summary of Null Hypotheses

| NULL HYPOTHESES | RESULTS |
| :---: | :---: |

$H_{0}$ 4. RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER PERSONS

| Job-related Personal Contacts |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Executives | Failed to Reject |
| Middle Management/Staff Personnel | Failed to Reject |
| Supervisors | Failed to Reject |
| Professional Personnel | Failed to Reject |
| Semiprofessional Personnel | Failed to Reject |
| Clerical Personnel | Failed to Reject |
| Manual and Service Workers | Failed to Reject |
| Sales Personnel | Rejected |
| Buyers | Failed to Reject |
| Customers | Failed to Reject (1, 3) |
| Students, Interns, and Trainees | Failed to Reject |
|  |  |
| Types of Cormmication |  |
| Advising |  |
| Negotiating | Failed to Reject |
| Persuading | Failed to Reject |
| Instructing | Failed to Reject |
| Interviewing | Failed to Reject |
| Routine lnformation Exchange | Failed to Reject |
| Nonroutine Information Exchange | Failed to Reject |
| Writing/Composing | Failed to Reject |
| Public Speaking | Failed to Reject |

$H_{0}$ 5. JOB CONTEXT

| Civic Obligations | Failed to Reject |
| :--- | :--- |
| Frustrating Situations | Failed to Reject |
| Strained Personal Contacts | Failed to Reject |
| Personal Sacrifice | Failed to Reject |
| Interpersonal Conflict Situations | Failed to Reject |

## $H_{0}$ 6. OTHER JOB CHARACTERISTICS

| Following Set Procedures | Failed to Reject |
| :--- | :--- |
| Time Pressure | Failed to Reject |
| Precision | Failed to Reject |
| Attention to Detail | Failed to Reject |
| Horking Under Distractions | Failed to Reject |
| Updating Job Knowledge | Failed to Reject |
| Special talent | Failed to Reject |

Note. Group $1=$ Stores with an annual sales volume under $\$ 300 \mathrm{million}$
Group 2 = Stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion Group 3 = Stores with an annual sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus

## CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study analyzed and compared the job content of the apparel buyer's position in department stores of three size categories determined by sales volume. Included in this chapter are summaries of the research procedure and research findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Results of the study provided the basis for recommendations for apparel retailers and future research.

## Summary of Research Procedure

The purpose of this study was to investigate the job content of apparel buyer positions in department stores and make comparisons of job elements across store sizes measured by annual sales volume. The Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) was used to determine worker-oriented behaviors in six major categories.

The main objectives of this study were to: (a) describe individual characteristics of department store apparel buyers, (b) describe the store characteristics and merchandise characteristics, and (c) investigate and compare the importance/extent of use of 55 job elements in six PAQ divisions among department store apparel buyers according to
three store sizes measured by an annual sales volume. The three size categories included small department stores with a sales volume under $\$ 300$ million, medium-sized department stores with a sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion, and large department stores with a sales volume of \$1 billion plus. Six worker-oriented behaviors that were studied through the PAQ include (a) information input (source of information), (b) mental processes, (c) work output (actions involved in jobs), (d) relationships with people (interpersonal activities in work), (e) job context, and (f) other job characteristics.

The population for this study was apparel buyers of retail stores listed on Stores magazine's 1990 listing of the Top 100 Department Stores (Schulz, 1991). Stores that had ceased operation were eliminated from the selection process. Also, excluded were stores that had combined buying offices with more than one retail division or buying offices located in more than one place.

Apparel buyers names were obtained from Sheldon's Retail Directory (1992). To select the sample buyers names were listed according to three annual sales volume categories. Within these categories, the buyers were listed by the following merchandise categories: (a) women's wear, (b) men's wear, and (c) children's wear. Selection was made to include 250 buyers in each merchandise catdegory and each
sales volume category. Thus, questionnaires were distributed to the total of 750 buyers.

* Summary of Findings

A sample of 185 department store apparel buyers responded to the questionnaire. The majority (63.2\%) were female. The largest group (51.3\%) were between 30 and 39 years of age. The majority (78.4\%) had a bachelor's or an advanced degree with the most common degree in business administration (38.8\%). Almost half of the buyers (46.7\%) had between 5 and 14 years experience in retailing, and $46.5 \%$ had 5 to 14 years of experience as a buyer.

Buyers were divided into three categories according to their stores' annual sales volume. The largest group (40.1\%) bought for stores with an annual sales volume of more than $\$ 1$ billion; $33.3 \%$ had a sales volume under $\$ 300$ million with $26.5 \%$ between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion. About half (52.5\%) of the buyers' departments had annual sales under $\$ 10$ million.

Buyers made multiple selections in the classification, end-use categories, and price points of merchandise. The largest group (77) of buyers purchased women's wear. Sixtyfive buyers bought men's wear, and 44 bought children's wear.

Among the 77 women's wear buyers 37 purchased career apparel, 37 purchased spectator sportswear, 26 bought active sportswear, and 18 bought casual dresses. Among the 65 men's wear buyers the largest groups of buyers (50) purchased sportswear. Nineteen buyers bought tailored clothing and 10 buyers bought men's furnishings.

The largest number of buyers (149) purchased moderatepriced apparel. One hundred buyers bought better-priced apparel and 62 buyers bought popular-priced apparel.

## Comparisons of Job Elements of PAQ by Company's Annual Sales Volume

In the PAQ division of Information Input, among all information sources, inventory was the most extensively used source by apparel buyers of department stores in all sales volume categories and the composite of all buyers. Quantitative materials were less extensively used by small department store buyers than any other sources. Resident buying offices were the least extensively used source by large department store buyers. Art and decor was the least extensively used source by the composite of all buyers and medium-sized department store buyers. Regardless of their stores' annual sale volume, the buyers perceived judging condition or quality as the most important activity and estimating size as the least important activity in performing their job.

In the PAQ division of Mental Processes, decision making was considered as the most important activity by the composite of all buyers and by small department stores buyers. Large department store buyers placed more importance on two job elements, decision making and reasoning in problem solving, than other job elements. Reasoning in problem solving was rated as the most important element by medium-sized department store buyers.

In the Mental Processes division of the PAQ compiling information was least important to the composite of all buyers and large department store buyers. Planning and scheduling was estimated as the least important element by small department store buyers.

In the PAQ division of Work Output regardless of department store's annual sales volume, keyboard devices were the most important job element. Arranging/positioning was least important to the composite of all buyers and buyers of stores in all three sizes.

In regard to Relationships with Other Persons contacts with supervisors was most important to small department store buyers. Contacts with middle management/staff personnel was most important to large department store buyers, medium-sized store buyers, and the composite of all buyers. Contacts with professional personnel was the least important job-related personal contact to buyers of all
three sizes of department stores and the composite of all buyers. In second subdivision, Types of Communication, negotiating was the most important job element to the composite of all buyers and buyers of department stores in all sizes. Public speaking was perceived as the least important type of communication by the composite of all buyers and buyers of stores in all three sales volume categories.

In the division of Job Context buyers of medium-sized department stores placed more importance on frustrating situation than any other job element. However, personal sacrifice was considered as most important to small department store buyers, large stores buyers, and the composite of all buyers. Civic obligation was least important to the composite of all buyers and buyers of department stores in all three sizes.

Regarding Other Job Characteristics working under distractions was most important to the composite of all buyers and buyers of department stores in all three sizes. Special talent was least important to the composite of all buyers and buyers of department stores in all three sizes.

## Summary of Hypothesized Findings

Six null hypotheses were examined in the present study to determine differences in the importance and the extent of
use of 55 job elements in the six PAQ divisions among department store buyers according to three annual sales volume categories. Sales categories included: (a) under $\$ 300$ million, (b) between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion, and (c) $\$ 1$ billion plus.

In the first division, Information Input, there were significant differences among store buyers in the extent of use of two information sources: events and resident buying offices. On the other hand, there was no significant difference in other information sources. Thus, department store buyers do not use the following information sources more extensively according to store's annual sales volume: written materials, quantitative materials, pictorial materials, inventory, consumer behavior, arts and decor, and verbal sources. There was no significant difference in importance of the following activities for completion of job among apparel buyers of stores with different annual sales volume categories: color perception, judging condition or quality, inspecting workmanship, estimating quantity, estimating size, and estimating time.

In the second division, Mental Processes, there was no significant difference among buyers of stores in three sizes in the following job processes: decision making, reasoning in problem solving, planning and scheduling, combining information, compiling information, and analyzing
information. In the division of Work Output, there was no significant difference in the importance of use of keyboard devices among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories. However, there was a significant difference in the importance of arranging/positioning among buyers of stores with different sales volume.

In the forth division, Relationships with Other Persons, there was a significant difference in the importance of contacts with sales personnel. On the other hand, there was no significant difference in other personal contacts: executives, middle management/staff personnel, supervisors, professional personnel, semiprofessional personnel, clerical personnel, manual and service workers, buyers, customers, and student, interns, and trainees. In the second subdivision there was no significant difference in importance of the following types of communication among apparel buyers with different annual sales volume categories: advising, negotiating, persuading, instructing, interviewing, routine information exchange, nonroutine information exchange, writing/composing, and public speaking.

In the fifth division, Job Context, there was no significant difference in the following work situations and environments of job context division among apparel buyers of
department stores with different annual sales volume categories: civic obligations, frustrating situations, strained personal contacts, personal sacrifice, and interpersonal conflict situations. In the last division, Other Job Characteristics there is no significant difference in the importance of the following other job characteristics among apparel buyers of department stores with different annual sales volume categories: following set procedures, time pressure, precision, attention to detail, working under distractions, updating job knowledge, and special talent.

Conclusions
Based on the data collected and the results of statistical analysis the following conclusions were drawn for the research sample:

1. Buyers of small department stores with an annual sales volume under $\$ 300$ million more extensively use events as an information source than do buyers of large department stores with an annual sale volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus and buyers of medium-sized department stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.
2. Buyers of large department stores with a sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus less extensively use a resident buying office as an information source than buyers of small department stores with an annual sales volume under $\$ 300$
million and buyers of medium-sized department stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.
3. Buyers of large department stores with an annual sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus perceive arranging/ positioning less importantly than buyers of small department stores with a sales volume under $\$ 300$ million and buyers of medium-sized department stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.
4. Buyers of small department stores with an annual sales volume under $\$ 300$ million perceive contacts with sales personnel more importantly than buyers of large department stores with an annual sale volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus and buyers of medium-sized department stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion.

Recommendations for Further Study
Based on related literature and information from this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. A similar study could be conducted to compare the job content among buyers of different types of stores, such as specialty apparel chain stores, department stores, discounters, and mass merchandisers. The job content of apparel buyers in such stores would be different because of differences in activities such as advertising, promotion, and merchandise strategy.
2. Further studies could be conducted to compare the job content of the buyer according to a buyer's departmental sales volume.
3. The study could be replicated to compare the job content of buyers among different merchandise categories, such as apparel, homefurnishings, electronics, etc.
4. An investigation of how resident buying offices can better meet the needs of department stores as a source of information.
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APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY APPAREL BUYER SURVEY

Please complete this questionnaire and return in the enclosed stamped envelope as soon as possible. To assure confidentiality do not put your name or store name on the survey form. Thank you for your time and effort.

## Q-1 EVALUATE THE IMPORTANCE OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES IN THE COMPLETION OF YOUR JOB. <br> Using the response scale at the left, rate <br> the importance of each activity to your job.

IMPORTANCE TO
YOUR JOB
0 Does not apply
1 Very minor
2 Low
3 Intermediate
4 High
5 Extreme
_1. Color perception--Differentiating or - identifying merchandise or details on the basis of color
2. Judging condition or quality-Estimating the condition, quality, and/or yalue of objects
$\qquad$ 3. Inspecting workmanship-Inspecting products or materials in terms of established standards
_4. Estimating quantity--Estimating the quantity of products in terms of weight number or volume
$\qquad$ 5. Estimating size--Estimating the dimensions of objects or products without direct measurements
$\qquad$ 6. Dstimating ime-easimatin required required for past or future events or work activities, e.g., judging the amount of time to make a delivery, or estimating the length of time required to complete a work activity
Q-2 THE IMPORTANCE OF MENTAL PROCESSES NEEDED TO PERFORM YOUR JOB
IMPORTANCE TO YOUR JOB

| 0 | Does not apply |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Very minor |
| 2 | Low |
| 3 | Intermediate |
| 4 | High |
| 5 | Extreme |

Using the response scale at the left rate the importance of each item to your job.
$\qquad$ 1. Decision making--Making decisions in performing various job activities
$\qquad$ 2. Reasoning in problem solving--Applying knowledge, experience, and judgement to problems
$\qquad$ 3. Planning \& scheduling required that affects own activities or the activities of others
$\qquad$ 4. Combining information Combining information--Combining, synthesizing, or integrating information or data from two or more sources to establish new facts or a more complete body of related information, e.g., predicting future trends
5. Compiling information--Gathering grouping classifying, or arranging information or daもa in some meaningful order e.gif preparing various reports, filing correspondence on the basis of content, or selecting data to be gathered
$\qquad$ 6. Analyzing information or data-Identifying underlying principles or facts by breaking aown information into component parts, e.g., interpreting financial reports


## Q-5 SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED IN PERFORMING YOUR JOB



Q-7 THE IMPORTANCE OF DEVICES OR ACTIVITIES IN THE COMPLETION OF YOUR JOB

IMPORTANCE TO YOUR JOB

Using the response scale at the left rate the importance of each item to your job.
0 Does not apply $\qquad$ 1. Keyboard devices--E.g. word processors, adding machines, calculators, computer keyboards and terminals, typewriters
$\qquad$ 2. Arranging/positioning-Manually placing objects, materials, e.g arranging displays, stocking shelves, positioning merchandise for sale
Q-8 THE IMPORTANCE OF JOB DEMANDS

IMPORTANCE TO
YOUR JOB

Does not apply
Very minor
Low
Intermediate
High
Extreme

This section lists various demands made upon workers usually requiring that they adapt to them in order to perform satisfactorily. Using the response scale at the left, rate the following items in terms of how important they are on your job.
$\qquad$ 1. Following set procedures--Need to follow specific procedures or routines to obtain satisfactory outcomes
2. Time pressure--E.gio urgent time
$\qquad$ deadilnes or rush jóbs
3. Precision--A need to be precise and accurate
4. Attention to detail--A need to be through and attentive to various details of onels work, being sure that nothing is left undone
$\qquad$ 5. Working under distractions--E.g. telephone calls, interruptions, or disturbances from others
6. Updating job knowledge--A need to keep job knowledge current and being informed of new job-related developments
7. special talent--A need for some particularly unusual or creative talent
8. Travel--Using the response scale below, indicate the proportion of time you are required to travel, usually overnight and away from your residence.

Amount of Time
Does not apply (or is incidental)
Under $1 / 10$ of the time
$1 / 10$ to $1 / 3$ of the time
$1 / 3$ to 2/3 of the time
over 2/3 of the time
Almost continually

PLEASE CHECK YOUR ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.
Q-9 What is your gender? $\quad 2 . \quad$ Female


Q-11 What is the highest level of education you completed?

1. __High school
2. ——Vocational/technical school
3. -Some college
4. ——Junior college degree
5. Bachelor's degree
6. -_Some graduate school
7. -Graduate degree

Q-12 If you have a college degree, what was your major area of study?

1. Arts and Sciences
2. -Business Administration
3. -Education
4. -Fashion Merchandising
5. -Homè Economics
6. —Oother (please list)

Q-13 How many total years have you worked in retailing?

1. __Less than 5 years
2.     - 5 to 14 years
3. _15 to 24 years
4.     - 25 years or more

Q-14 How many total years have you been employed as a retail buyer?

1. Less than 5 years

2 $\qquad$ 5 to 14 years
3. -15 to 24 years
4. - 25 years or more

Q-15 What type of merchandise do you buy?
(Check all that apply)

1. Women's Wear
2.     - Men's Wear
3. ——Children's/infants' wear
4. ——Other (please indicate)

Q-16 Which classification of end-use describes the merchandise you buy?
(Check all that apply)
WOMEN'S APPAREL
MEN'S APPAREL

1. __Coats/suits
2. ___ Men's furnishings
3. -_Career apparel
4. -Casual dresses
5. ——Special occasion dresses
6. —Sportswear-active
7. —Sportswear-spectator
8. —Lingerie/loungewear
9. ——Other (specify)

Q-17 What are the price points of the merchandise you buy? (Check all that apply)

1. __ Popular (Buaget)
2. ——Moderate
3. ——Better
4. ——Bridge
5. ——Designer
6.     - Other (specify)

Q-18 What is your department's approximate annual gross sales? 1. Under $\$ 10$ million
2. - $\$ 10-99$ million
3. - $\$ 100-249$ million
4. - $\$ 250$ million plus

Q-19 What is your company's approximate annual gross sales? 1. Under $\$ 100$ million
2. - $\$ 100-499$ million
3. —\$500-999 million
4. $\qquad$ \$1 billion plus
Q-20 How many persons do you directly supervise as part of your job responsibilities?
1.
2. -1 or 2 workers
3. - 3 to 5 workers
4. $\qquad$ or more workers

Q-21 What level of physical exertion is required to perform your job? Very light
2. ——Light
3. Moderate
4. _Heavy
5. __Very heavy

Q-22 What type of supervision do you typically receive?
1 .

- Immediate supervision

2. ——General supervision
3. —General direction
4. -Nominal direction
5. No supervision

Q-23 What is the highest of mathematics needed to perform your job? Does not apply
2. ——Basic-AAdition and subtraction of 3 digit numbers multiplication, and division
3. _ Intermediate--Fractions, decimals, and percentages
4. ——Advanced-Algebra, geometry, trigonometry, and statistics
5. Very advanced--Advanced mathematical and statistical theory, e.g., calculus, topology, vector analysis, factor analysis, or probability theory

## APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO DEPARTMENT STORE BUYERS

## Date

```
Buyer's Name or Current Buyer
Merchandise Category
Store Name
Address of Store
```

Dear [Buyer's Name]:

You have been selected to participate in a nationwide study of department store buyers. The purpose of this study is to analyze the job content of buyers' positions. Your response will be important to the completion of this research project and will lead to a better understanding of the buyer's position.

You can be assured that the study is carefully designed so that individual companies cannot be identified, and your name will not appear in the research results.

Because people such as you have extensive experience in buying, it is important that buyers, not educators, determine the analysis of the buyer's position. Please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire in the enveloped provided by March 3, 1993.

If you have any questions regarding the study or the questionnaire, please contact me at (817) 898-1255.

Your responses will be beneficial in studying an important retailing institution in America, the department store. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,


Sung Jee Chung Doctoral candidate


[^1]
## APPENDIX C

PERMISSION TO USE PAQ

# Purdue Research Foundation 



January 6, 1993
Division of
Sponsored Programs
Sung Jee Chung
1822 Teasley Lane \#610
Denton, Texas 76205
Dear Ms. Chung:
This is in response to your letter of December 1, 1992, in which you request permission to reprint portions of the Position Analysis Questionnaire for research purposes in your doctoral dissertation.

Purdue Research Foundation hereby grants you permission to reprint the sections as requested in your above letter. Please be sure to reference the appropriate copyright acknowledgement.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if our office can provide any further assistance.


## APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTIVE DATA: BUYERS

| Variable | N | Classification | $\underline{n}$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 185 | Male | 68 | 36.8 |
|  |  | Female | 117 | 63.2 |
| Age | 185 | Under 30 | 34 | 18.4 |
|  |  | 30-39 | 96 | 51.9 |
|  |  | 40-49 | 36 | 9.5 |
|  |  | Over 50 | 19 | 10.3 |
| Education | 185 | High School | 6 | 3.2 |
|  |  | Vocational/technical | 4 | 2.2 |
|  |  | School |  | 7.0 |
|  |  | Some College | 13 |  |
|  |  | Junior College Degree | 17 | 9.2 |
|  |  | Bachelor's Degree | 125 | 67.6 |
|  |  | Some Graduate School | 10 | 5.4 |
|  |  | Graduate School | 10 | 5.4 |
| Major Area | 185 | Arts and Sciences | 26 | 16.0 |
|  |  | Business | 63 | 38.7 |
|  |  | Administration | 6 | 3.7 |
|  |  | Education | 28 | 17.2 |
|  |  | Fashion Merchandising | 7 | 4.3 |
|  |  | Home Economics | 9 | 5.5 |
|  |  | Marketing | 24 | 14.6 |
|  |  | Other |  |  |
| Years of Experience in Retailing | 185 | Less than 5 Years | 10 | 5.5 |
|  |  | 5-14 Years | 85 | 46.7 |
|  |  | 15-24 Years | 62 | 34.1 |
|  |  | More than 25 Years | 25 | 13.7 |
| Years of Experience as a Buyer | 185 | Less than 5 Years | 58 | 31.4 |
|  |  | 5-14 Years | 86 | 46.5 |
|  |  | 15-24 Years | 33 | 17.8 |
|  |  | More than 25 Years | 8 | 4.3 |

## APPENDIX E

DESCRIPTIVE DATA: DEPARTMENT STORES



[^0]:    Note. Group $1=$ Stores with an annual sales volume under $\$ 300 \mathrm{million}$ Group $2=$ Stores with an annual sales volume between $\$ 300$ million and $\$ 1$ billion Group 3 = Stores with an annual sales volume of $\$ 1$ billion plus

[^1]:    Enclosures

