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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many students enter college knowing little about themselves, unaware of where their strengths and abilities lie, and uninformed concerning career-educational opportunities available to them. The educational environment forces career decision-making at certain arbitrary points and most students respond by making a decision of some sort. This educational-vocational decision is quite often made as though it were irrevocable, second in importance only to their choice of a lifetime partner (Gruen, 1968). The eighteen or nineteen year old who must decide upon a major field of study by the end of his sophomore year in college may have had little experience in independent decision making and may have developed no effective strategies for decision-making (Campbell, Walz, Miller and Krieger, 1973). Under these conditions a given career decision may be the product of an inadequate decision-making process.

A number of students respond to this educational-vocational choice dilemma with anxiety. Many make decision
after decision in virtual aimlessness during their college years. Several surveys have indicated that 30 to 50 percent of a given student class will change their major at least once by the time they graduate; 15 to 20 percent will have changed majors two or more times (Cook, 1970; Hoyt and Danskin, 1970; Rochester and McBride, 1970).

Students are most inclined to either drop out or change their majors during their freshman and sophomore years (Thompson and Mahr, 1971), feeling that they made their initial choices with "too little" or "inaccurate" information, usually provided by parents and friends rather than by better informed advisors and counselors (Danskin and Hoyts, 1960; Rochester and McBride, 1970). Making such changes in their educational-vocational plans can precipitate a choice "crisis" and may negatively influence the students' attitudes toward themselves and the university (Katz and Korn, 1968; Pierson, 1962; Waterman and Waterman, 1970).

This problem is especially evident in the field of teacher education where data show an overabundance of people attempting to enter the field (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1971). Having relatively little personal-experiential field training until the end of the degree program (N.E.A. Research Bulletin, 1971). This results in a high frequency of casualties or people who, in fact, become teachers and then realize this career is not for
them, because of an inadequate decision-making process (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1971). This ineffective career decision-making brings about a "waste" not only to the individual but also to the school systems involved in training and/or placement (Graybeal, 1971).

There is a new and increasing emphasis on the notion of preparing professional teachers who are seriously and meaningfully committed to careers in education. The initial decision to enter teaching is often made casually with little real knowledge of either self or teaching. This new emphasis then is toward providing students with a combination of work and academic experience to help them to make better educational, career, and personal social decisions (N.E.A. Research Bulletin, 1971). Various teacher preparation institutions have tested and examined possible means of improving the experience aspect of their programs, beginning with undergraduate students who express an interest in teaching as a career. By this means, students may engage in an early and continual process of combining academic work and reality testing in order to make sound decisions regarding their future.

At The Ohio State University, in the Fall of 1971, the Freshman Early Experience Program (F.E.E.P.), a preprofessional, experience-centered teacher education program, was implemented in response to the above problem. The major goal of the program is to give students who express
an interest in teaching as a career an opportunity to
explore their personal, career, and educational develop-
ment by providing a core of exploratory experiences at the
outset of the students' university program, in order to
promote personal and professional development. Hopefully,
through F.E.E.P., earlier and more mature career decisions
will be made and the "waste" to individuals and the school
system can be avoided.

It seems that the question now becomes one of ex-
amining various methods of interventions that might increase
the efficiency of the Freshman Early Experience Program
and further increase the frequency of mature career deci-
sions. The Career Life Planning Seminar (Winer, 1974;
Metz, 1974) is a vocational psychological intervention
whose major goals are also to provide students an oppor-
tunity to explore their personal, career, educational de-
velopment. The Career Life Planning Seminar presents the
student with information about the world of work and his
own work relevant characteristics within the framework
recommended by Campbell, et. al. (1973):

A) Information about majors and work;
B) How to gather information on one's own;
C) How to evaluate such information and use it
   in decision-making.
D) Skills in acquiring a job.
This study examines the intervention effect of the Career Life Planning Seminar on the goals for students enrolled in the Freshman Early Experience Program (i.e., the personal, career, and educational development of the F.E.E.P. student). It is hypothesized that while the experiential program alone (F.E.E.P.) may significantly improve the personal, career, and educational development of the subjects, the experiential program plus the Career Life Planning Seminar (the intervention) will best facilitate these three aspects of student development.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature related to this study may be divided into the following subsections: (1) The Process of "Normal" Career Development; (2) Critique of Career/Vocational Intervention Programs; (3) Effectiveness of Career Vocational Intervention Programs; (4) The Teacher Surplus; and, (5) Experience-based Teacher Learning Programs.

The Process of "Normal" Career Development

Much of the current research in career/vocational guidance is concerned with the developmental events that undergird the process of career choice. Although there has been some debate over the issue of whether or not career choice is a singular event or a series of decisions, the general consensus in recent times has been that the career decision is a multifaceted process occurring at conscious and unconscious levels of awareness through a process of assimilation and exclusion (Crites, 1969). Super (1957) described the process in the following manner:

-6-
The term vocational choice, widely used in discussions and studies of vocational development and adjustment, conveys a misleading notion of neatness and precision in time. ... Choice is in fact, a process rather than an event ... the term should denote a whole series of choices, generally resulting in the elimination of some alternatives and the retention of others, until in due course the narrowing down process results in what might be called an occupational choice (p.187).

Hershenson (1968) and others (Goodson, 1970; Ivey and Morrill, 1968; Kroll, et al., 1970; Morrill and Forrest, 1970; Tiedeman, 1961) have pointed out that the career decision process covers a range of choice behaviors. As described by these authors, the career decision process spans a range of from "no choice," to "tentative choice," to "final choice." Furthermore, in this view, vocational choice is conceived of as being systematic and not a choice behavior (Crites, 1969). That is, "there are reliable individual differences in choice, and there are statistically significant relationships between it and other variables" (Crites, 1969, p. 571), such as, culture, social class, aptitudes, and interests.

Crites (1969) succinctly summarized the general findings on the developmental trends in career choice.

1. Vocational choice is a process, a series of related behavioral events, but is not wholly continuous. There is at least one discontinuity in it between ages fourteen and sixteen, when there, first indecision and, then, indiscriminateness in choice.

2. After age sixteen, the choice process becomes more and more exclusive, as negative
and the relationships among choice, preference, aspiration, and interest change.

3. That there are stages in the choice process seems apparent, but their limits are not well established empirically with the possible exception of the Fantasy stage, which probably begins about age nine and ends around age thirteen. Crystallization and Specification of choice appear to occur between ages eighteen and twenty one in the Realistic stage, during which there is also a trend toward greater realism in choice (p. 571).

To summarize, career development research indicates that the career decision process involves a series of interrelated social and behavioral events which begin during the early school years with a fantasized and generally unrealistic view of the occupational world. Through a process of exclusion and inclusion of career related information, during the late adolescent years the individual moves toward making more realistic career decisions which culminate in a final career choice at or around age twenty one (Crites, 1969).

Critique or Career/Vocational Intervention Programs

The need to develop effective and efficient career/vocational intervention programs at every level of our country's educational system has long been recognized. Recently, however, many such programs have been criticized for not keeping abreast of current career development theory:

In recent years, especially under the impetus of federal legislation such as the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (VEA) and its subsequent
amendments, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965, there has been increased concern about the career guidance of youth. This concern has been expressed by parents, counselors, vocational educators, public officials, business, and industry. One of the charges, often substantiated by examination of practices in the schools, is that schools have not kept pace with current career development concepts (p.3).

Another criticism has been raised by Hoppoch (1967) who stated that "up to the present time, most of what has been done in counseling and guidance has been done because it seemed like a good idea. Only in rare instances has anyone attempted to find out whether or not the anticipated results were in fact achieved," (p. 318). A similar conclusion was reached by Hansen (1970, p. 13) who noted "... a serious dearth of evaluative research on behavioral outcomes" in career guidance practices in the schools.

Katz (1966, p. 3) succinctly stated some of the important elements in defining and assessing the aims, goals, and objectives of career guidance programs. He suggested that one "cannot discuss what vocational guidance is (content) without indicating what it does (process), what it is for (purpose), who is involved (participants), in what place and at what time (setting)."

Most vocational theorists agree that career planning is a developmental process involving a lifelong series of decisions rather than a single occupational choice (Crites, 1969; Morrill and Forrest, 1971; Osipow, 1968; Wren, 1966).
However, many universities treat vocational decisions as though they were irrevocable and made once, usually during the student's sophomore year of college. This "but one alternative" outlook brings some students to the point of equating educational choice and occupational choice when the two are not necessarily synonymous (Cook, 1970; Goodson, 1970). Students are inclined to make their initial choices with "too little" or "inaccurate" information, usually provided by parents and friends rather than better informed advisors and counselors (Danskin and Hoyt, 1960). This finally results in students entering career fields that are already overflowing with candidates (i.e., teacher education, N.E.A. Research Bulletin, 1971), or discovering that their initial career choice does not really suit their personalities or life styles (Waterman and Waterman, 1970).

In summary, much of the career development programming that has been and continues to be offered to students suffers from: (a) a tendency to disregard recent research and theoretical trends in the field of career development; (b) a failure to empirically ascertain program effectiveness; and, (c) a failure to operationally define programming objectives in a way that lends itself to meaningful research.

**Effectiveness of Career/Vocational Intervention Programs**

Despite the critical commentary given thus far to career/vocational intervention programs, there is evidence
to suggest that well-organized, structured programs offer an effective means of helping young people in their pursuit of an occupation.

In a rather extensive review of the literature, Hoppock (1967) reached the following tentative conclusions concerning the merits of career guidance activities:

Courses in occupations measurably increased the subsequent job satisfaction and earning power of the students who went to work and the academic success of the students who went to college.

Courses in occupations reduced unemployment among both graduates and dropouts.

Courses in occupations measurably increased the range of occupations in which students were interested and their interest in specific occupations.

Courses in occupations increased the ability of students to answer questions about occupations by as little as 0 and as much as 217 percent.

Courses in occupations with emphasis upon local opportunities for employment, brought occupational choices into closer harmony with employment opportunity, but failed to bring them into closer harmony with the measured abilities of the students but failed to bring them into closer harmony with employment opportunity.

Courses in occupations, plus individual counseling, produced better results than either one alone.

Courses in occupations increased the demand for individual counseling.

Preliminary group sessions facilitated subsequent counseling.

Small group meetings were as effective as individual counseling and more economical (pp. 379-380).
Several guidance programs developed with an emphasis on assisting undecided students have enjoyed considerable success (Leonard, 1968; 1969; Paulson and Gordon, 1967; Pruitt, 1967; Stiller, 1968). One of the more comprehensive of these projects is the Developmental Career Guidance Project directed at the University of Detroit (Leonard, 1968; 1969). The kinds of activity carried on in the project include individual and group counseling, dissemination of occupational information through classes and special assemblies, field trips, and community involvement activities. Preliminary data suggest that the students who participated in the program showed: (1) an increase in their level of aspiration, (2) growth in regard to occupational knowledge and planning, (3) re-examination of their value structures, (4) a more acceptable attitude toward counselors, and, (5) an increased tendency to recognize and acknowledge their need for career guidance (Leonard, 1969).

Project PIT (1967) at the University of Illinois combined work experience and vocational guidance. The early results of this project indicate that the participants showed a significant shift in their educational and occupational aspirations to a higher and more realistic level.

Nick (1942) found that when information about local employment opportunities was presented to 11th and 12th grade students through school assemblies and through group and individual conferences, the students' occupational
plans were brought into closer harmony with existing employment opportunities. Ziegler (1962) emphasized that job searching can be taught to small groups in a short period of time. He met with 1,000 unemployed and underemployed adults in small groups for two sessions of one and one-half hours each. Of the 1,000 participants, 700 found jobs, half of them in two weeks.

The Life Planning Workshop (Hinkle and Thomas, 1970) is a programmatic intervention designed to involve the college student in influencing his own future. The focus is on helping the student develop an accurate perspective of himself in the present, as well as a realistic outlook on his ability to be the primary determiner of his future. Once a person has established where he is and where he wants to go, he can begin to work on short-term and long-range goals. Hopefully, by the end of the workshop session, (usually completed in one day), the individual will have increased self-awareness, and will realize the need for a specific, but flexible, plan of action for reaching his future goals. According to Delworth (1972), a long-term follow-up questionnaire indicated that 80 percent of those who responded (60 percent) viewed the workshop as a helpful or a very helpful experience. A number of participants indicated that they had taken action as a result of the workshop.

To summarize, despite several criticisms of career/vocational guidance practices, there is evidence to suggest
that well-designed programs are generally helpful to students because of both the amount of information retained and the amount of self-exploration they produce.

The Teacher Surplus

College and university graduates of the 1970's face conditions similar to those their parents faced during and following the depression years of the 1930's—very few jobs and very many candidates. The teaching field has not escaped the predicament; jobs are less plentiful today than they were in the late 1960's.

A recent National Education Association Research Bulletin (1972) is quoted by educators to show how rapidly the demand for teachers diminished. According to the report in 1971, only 10,000 positions were added in public schools compared with 36,000 in 1970 and 78,000 in 1969. The situation is compounded by developments related to the number of teacher education graduates produced during this period. In 1969 the number of graduates prepared to teach was 266,261; in 1970 the number increased to 292,634; and in 1971 it jumped to 305,711. The teacher surplus is projected to total 312,000 graduates in 1972 and 412,000 by 1979 if production continues to increase at the present rate.

Further evidence of the over supply of teachers has been reported in the Digest of Educational Statistics (1971)

Numerous writers have addressed this problem of teacher surplus. Venn (1973) suggests that the obvious answer to the teacher surplus is to start reducing the number of graduate with majors in overcrowded fields. Providing information earlier about job opportunities should also cause students in high school and in the first two years of college to adjust their decisions. He goes on to say that more teacher-related and in-school experiences during the four or five year teacher education programs will improve both self-selection and opportunities for evaluation of performance.

Arthur Bush (1972) suggests the following for consideration in improving teacher surplus situation:

1) Reduce the total number of teachers.
2) Markedly increase the level of competence and training required for entrance into teaching.
3) Provide conditions so that students aspiring to be teachers will have teacher-oriented experiences early (Freshman-Sophomore year) in their academic training program.

William S. Graybeal (1971) has commented on the current conditions in the teaching field as follows:
This outlook of increasing unemployment among graduates preparing to teach calls for teacher educators to take responsible action towards raising the standards for entry into teacher education programs.

Implications of the oversupply of teachers, according to Graybeal, suggest that:

The NEA establish a task force on the underutilization of educational personnel ... to urge teacher education institutions to begin at once to improve the quality of prospective teachers being prepared, and to select for preparation only the students with high aptitude and qualifications for teaching and to then allow these students to experience teaching (classroom) very early in their training for self-selecting and training purposes.

Teacher education programs must provide more varied and earlier experiences so that the student can make realistic decisions about teaching as a career. Trudy Banta (1972) states that one of the advantages of teacher-related experiences early in the college or university program is to help the potential teacher get a true feeling of what teaching is really like. These experiences should help the individual develop a clear understanding of the job description of a teacher and a feeling for the difficulty of the job.

Along the same line, Rieger (1972) states that the process of self-selection can be in operation for at least three years while the student is in the teacher education program. Teachers with whom the student works, as well as college and university supervisors, can help the student
develop competence, and can simultaneously evaluate the prospective teacher's performance. The quality of the teacher candidate should thereby be upgraded since the student may counsel himself out of the program or, through careful screening and evaluation, be advised that he does not have either the personal qualities and/or the professional skills to adequately perform as a teacher. The screening could reduce the number of teacher education graduates, and, at the same time, improve quality.

In summary, it seems that the teacher surplus is real and that college and high school students need, more than ever, to base career decisions on the best information available about the changing demands for employment. Information needs to be collected and disseminated so that society in general—especially counselors, program advisors, students, and parents—are provided with the facts about the supply/demand situation. The literature has also shown that providing more teacher-related experiences early in a student's academic training will better help the student self-select the career of his choice, and, in the long run, improve the quality and status of teaching.

**Experience-based Teacher Learning Programs**

Recommendations for experience-based learning in the area of teacher education have been taken seriously by several institutions. As a result, programs with an
experiential component have been developed, piloted, and implemented. In some instances, participation has become a requirement for acceptance into the College of Education.

Strowbridge (1970) summarized the work of a cooperative venture between three elementary schools and Oregon State University Division of Elementary Education. Sophomores at that institution participate in classroom activities four half days each week, with the remainder of the day devoted to seminars taught primarily by college staff. One major basis for the program is the concept that students can best learn the techniques and theory of teaching by direct involvement in teaching children. Involvement in this situation must be continuous, it must be undertaken over an extended period of time, at several levels of competency, and must occur with children in a regular elementary school classroom. Seminars are designed to integrate classroom teaching experiences with foundation and method courses in education. The sequence for participation is: sophomore year, tutor; junior year, aide. At the time that this article was written, fourteen sophomore tutors were enrolled in the program. No empirical results were reported as to any significant effects of this program.

An Experimental Pilot Program in Teacher Education was inaugurated at City College of New York in the fall of 1969 with an entering freshman class of one hundred. This is a four-year program. All work in professional education
is given through field work and related seminars. This eliminates all formal courses in education. Seminars of approximately twenty students focus on review and analysis of field experience, discussions of readings, lectures, panel discussions, reports, and guest speakers. Students are also required to do independent study and reading.

The first year, first semester program contains an introduction to children and youth in the school setting. Emphasis is on observation and analysis of curricular offerings, teaching patterns, staff, facilities, and school services in the participating schools. Again, no solid evaluative data for this program was presented.

Georgia University (1969) has implemented a series of activities designed to introduce the future teacher to the many activities often centered around the opening of a new school year; it has been named The School Practicum. The sophomore college student with aid from the college, arranges to spend two weeks in a public school, usually in his home community, at the beginning of school in the fall, before the university opens for fall quarter. The purposes of this arrangement are: 1) to find out what a teacher does at the beginning of a new school year, 2) to form a basis for personal decisions concerning teaching as a career by helping the student to answer such questions as: "Do I really want to teach?" "What grade level or teaching
field do I prefer?" "What knowledge must a teacher possess?" "How does a teacher gain the respect of pupils?"

The student receives one hour of credit upon completion of The School Practicum and a series of seminar sessions held throughout fall quarter. The Practicum is a pre-requisite for admission to student teaching in the following areas: Early Childhood, Elementary, Business Education, Language Education, Speech Pathology, Mental Retardation, Motor Handicapped, and Physical Education. Other students, however, are also encouraged to take part.

Activities in which the student is encouraged to take part include the following: 1) attend planning meetings of the school staff, 2) attend faculty and other association meetings, 3) prepare and make use of teaching materials, 4) work with individual or small groups of pupils needing help, 5) teach part of a lesson or lessons, 6) talk with teachers and other staff members concerning their roles in the total school program, and, 7) assist with clerical work in the principal's office (1 day--no more).

Evaluation reports are sent to seminar instructors, and are kept confidential; they must be returned after the conclusion of the seminars. Evaluation of the entire program, however, remains descriptive and subjective in nature with no empirical findings reported.
Seminars meet in six one-hour or three two-hour sessions with approximately twenty-five students. The discussions are based on school experiences; students are asked to explore and analyze the personal meaning these experiences had for them. Grading is either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.

The University of Florida (1970) has set up a program for juniors and seniors in Elementary Education which contains, as four of its five general objectives: 1) The development of the "Self as Instrument Concept"—an effective teacher is one who has learned how to use himself and his knowledge of children and subject matter effectively. This kind of personal discovery calls for a program providing maximum opportunity for self direction and student responsibility for learning. 2) Maximum flexibility. 3) Close relationship of didactic instruction and practical experience. Participation in actual teaching should begin as early as possible. Thereafter, programs should provide for continuously increasing time and responsibility in the classroom. 4) Relation of learning to need. Need to know should precede exposure to information. Learning is likely to take place only when it is personally meaningful and relevant to the need of the learner.

Students in this program are in some field experience based aspect of teaching every quarter they participate
in the program. It is designed to provide students a variety of experiences in urban, suburban, laboratory, ghetto and middle class schools. The levels of participation are as follows:

Level 1: Classroom one hour per week, four to ten weeks; observation and tutoring one hour per week for ten weeks.

Level 2: Teacher assistant--assigned to a teacher six hours per week; assists however he can.

Level 3: Teacher associate--goes from two hours per day to five weeks of full-time responsibility.

Evaluation of this experience consists of pre and post tests on a battery of thirteen instruments to measure things such as attitudes, beliefs, values, self-concept, social cohesion, creativity, social status and personality. Experimental and control groups (from the regular program) are set up and results compared although no significant differences between groups were found.

Verduin (1970) suggests three reasons for a teacher-aide experience for students on the campus of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale: 1) First-year teachers recommend it, feeling that an early exposure to various teaching-learning situations would familiarize them with the problems and concerns of teaching. 2) Students' requests that they somehow be assured that teaching is for them before it is too late to change college plans. 3) To give
meaning and vitality to college work which the student is doing. The teacher aide work is done two hours a day, one day a week in a public school. Again, no empirical evalutative data for this program was presented.

Marso (1971) writes an account of research conducted at Bowling Green State University on a program developed to provide more and earlier classroom experiences in the teacher preparation program. The program is three-phased—phase one involves an educational psychology course; in phase two, the student develops instructional methods and skills while teaching small groups of children three days per week in a public school under the supervision of a university instructor; phase three involves the student in investigating the operation, goals, programs, and problems of an entire urban school system and obtaining further experience in the classroom. Students involved were juniors and seniors in education who, as teacher aides, observed classes, tutored individual students, and taught lessons to small groups and entire classes.

As a requirement of the program, daily logs were maintained and an evaluation form used at the end of the quarter. These two sources of information were descriptive in nature and indicated that students had many relevant and meaningful experiences that favorably increased their attitude toward teacher and students; they felt
more sure of their decision to teach or not to teach, and
the experience made them feel more prepared to be a teacher,
but no empirical evidence was provided.

Myers, Watts, White and Yonts (1971) reported that
school systems, community agencies, and other concerned
groups are requesting increased roles in teacher education.
This, the authors contend, is a good sign and should be en-
couraged. They presented a description of three cooperative
programs which were operative in metropolitan Nashville,
Tennessee, one of which is The Community Agency Project.

Community agency experiences are based on the
rationale that prospective teachers should have early con-
tact with children and youth in a variety of settings.
These experiences are to: 1) provide exploratory experi-
ences; 2) help college students firmly establish their
goals; 3) give insights into community problems, cultural
differences, and emotional and motivational problems; 4)
give students opportunities to put their altruistic feelings
into practice; 5) serve as screening devices, as some stu-
dents who think they want to teach find, upon working with
children and youth in community agencies, that they would
rather pursue another vocation.

The students who participate in this program are
George Peabody College students in their sophomore or second
semester freshman year. They arrange their schedules so
that one-half day each week can be spent in an agency. Students are expected to supply their own transportation, and are given a choice of agencies and activities. Each student is assigned a college coordinator who is an advanced graduate student or faculty member. The coordinators visit agencies and confer regularly with participants. The students are asked to keep logs and participate in a final evaluation of their experience. It is intended that the agencies give the pre-service teacher feelings of need, belonging, and accomplishment. The authors indicated that the Peabody Division of Education plans to continue this program. As with the other studies reported, no solid evaluative data for the success of this program were presented.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, in its Final Report concerning the Model Teacher Education Programs (1968), compiled considerable information on field-based learning such as in these following models: Teachers College, Columbia University, suggested what was termed a Contact Laboratory, which would provide students with contact with schools or children; Florida State's underclass phase provided for clinical involvement in simulated teaching situations including direct experience with children; Georgia's model made provision for students to work as teacher aides and teacher assistants in school settings before admission to
the professional program; Michigan State's provision for a clinical experience component beginning in the first year and extending through a year of teaching internship is outlined; the Northwest Regional Laboratory's program stressed laboratory experience as critical in its preparatory phase; the Pittsburgh model stresses the necessity for linkage with public school districts for the establishment of clinical settings, and Syracuse suggests that one or more public schools serve the function of tutorial and micro-teaching center in its teacher-education program.

The Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1969) provided a reference to pre-practice-teaching clinical experiences provided by Northwestern University's Tutorial and Clinical Program, which begins in the freshman year with classroom visits and dialogues with teachers and progresses through volunteer work in community agencies, attendance at school board meetings, teacher aide experiences in schools, and school-based research work to the actual half-day practice teaching in the senior year.

The Encyclopedia also referred to two other programs which are field-based—one at San Francisco State College, in which the professional courses are built around a series of laboratory experiences geared toward the personal development of each teacher candidate, and the other being Michigan State's Elementary Intern Program; and undergraduate program which places each elementary teacher candidate in a
full-time teaching experience in a regular school on a salaried basis.

Bosley (1969) also wrote of Michigan State's clinical experience component. This tutorial component provides early experiences with children during the first two years of college. The purposes are: 1) role identification, 2) self-screening, 3) reality testing, 4) sensitivity training, and 5) general awareness of people. During the two-year period, students work in one or more child-related roles.

Bridging the gap between theory and "know-how"; the Education Department of the College of Steubenville concluded in 1973 that a drastic need existed for a program to enrich the students with a more comprehensive background of elementary education. The Early Experience program was thus initiated to work in conjunction with the required course of study for all full-time elementary education majors. The program places Freshmen through Senior students in the classrooms of parochial and public schools, in the surrounding area, thus giving the student personnel contact with methods and techniques, small group instruction, insight to the development of a philosophy of education, classroom structure, and, most importantly, direct involvement with children. As with many of the other studies reported, no solid evaluative data for the success of this program were presented.
In 1973 the Education Department of Lyndon State College in Vermont established an Exploratory Field Experience program in which a field based program is available for those students who indicate the wish to pursue a professional career in education. The aim of the program is to assist the student in making an intelligent career choice early in his college years. The program is set for the first semester of the sophomore year. Public school personnel offer their classrooms as laboratories for the college courses and serve as consultants as well as team teachers. The students serve as aides in the schools for five half days per week. In addition to being in the classrooms, students attend specially designed courses entitled "American Education," "Educational Psychology--Human Development" and "Educational Workshop." These courses utilize the daily activities and experiences the students find in the schools. Unfortunately no empirical research was undertaken to assess any significant effect of the program.

In summary, the literature relative to over a dozen teacher education programs focusing on experience-based learning indicates that most programs which provided information on numbers of participants involve a relatively small number of students (25-100). A variety of experiences are offered in most cases. Some type of subjective evaluation of the experience is required of the student.
Participation of students in some type of seminar is emphasized, and often mandatory. Most programs do not make provision for experience prior to the sophomore year. Most are offered on a voluntary, rather than required, basis. Emphasis is on experience which will aid in career decision-making based on reality testing.

A major limitation that remains consistent throughout this section is that available evaluative data from existing programs tend to be descriptive and subjective rather than empirical in nature. Only in the program at the University of Florida (1970) was there any reported attempt to empirically evaluate the effectiveness of the program and little significance between control and experimental groups was found. More controlled research must be implemented before the real effect of such experiential teacher-training programs can be assessed.

Statement of Problem

This study examines the intervention effect of the Career Life Planning Seminar on the personal, career, and educational development of the students enrolled in the Freshman Early Experience Program in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. It is hypothesized that while the experiential program alone (F.E.E.P.) may significantly improve the personal, career, and educational development of the subjects, the experiential program plus the
Career Life Planning Seminar (the intervention) will best facilitate these three aspects of student development.

More specifically, the hypotheses to be tested are as follows:

**Hypothesis 1:** Subjects receiving the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar will be significantly higher in their level of personal development than subjects receiving the F.E.E.P. experience only.

**Hypothesis 2:** Subjects receiving the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar will be significantly higher in their level of career development than subjects receiving the F.E.E.P. experience only.

**Hypothesis 3:** Subjects receiving the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar will be significantly higher in their level of educational development than subjects receiving the F.E.E.P. experience only.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects studied here were drawn from the population of freshman and sophomore students at The Ohio State University enrolled in the Freshman Early Experience Program (F.E.E.P.) (College of Education) during Winter Quarter, 1975. The F.E.E.P. is a pre-professional experience-centered teacher education program that gives students a core of exploratory experiences in the classroom during the beginning of their university program. Every student who pre-selects education as a major must enroll in F.E.E.P. as an entry requirement for eight total hours of credit. More specific information regarding the subjects and a description of the groups in which they were assigned will be presented in the procedure section of this chapter.

Instruments

The major variables assessed in this study were personal, career, and educational development outcomes of
the subjects. Respectively, the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), Career Assessment Form (CAP), the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI), and the Teacher Preference Schedule (TPS) were employed to measure changes in these variables.

**Personal Orientation Inventory**

The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) developed by Shostrom (1963) purports to assess a level of self-actualization and is based on the assumption that each subject's system of values is reflected by each person's ability to transcend dichotomies. This ability to transcend dichotomies represents the individual's psychological health.

As Shostrom states (1963) a self-actualized person is conceptualized as one who utilizes his talents and capabilities more fully, uses his time effectively by living in the present, functions relatively autonomously, and tends to have a more benevolent outlook on life. The POI was used in this study to measure the personal development variable of this study.

The POI consists of one hundred and fifty choice comparative value and behavior judgments which were derived from research and theoretical formulation of writers in Humanistic, Existential, Gestalt Therapy, or Rational Therapy (Perls, 1951; Maslow, 1954; 1962; Horney, 1950;
Rogers, 1961; and Ellis, 1962). The POI yields measures for fourteen scales. The first two, time competence-incompetence and inner-other directedness, represent ratio scores. Shostrøm (1964) suggests that these ratio scores not be used in correlations and other statistical analyses. Thus, twelve scores remain. Each test item is scored twice, once for the two major scales—time competence (twenty-three items) and inner-directedness (one hundred and twenty-seven items), and then for the ten sub-scales. (A copy of the POI is contained in Appendix A)

The following are descriptions and scoring categories for the major scales:

1. Major scales
   a. Time competence (Tc) - This scale measures the degree to which one is "present" oriented.
   b. Inner directedness (I) - This scale measures the degree to which one is oriented toward others or self.

Damm (1968), in an attempt to determine the best overall measure of self-actualization, analyzed the considerable range in the number of items per scale. The basic problem was that the range was between 9 and 127. The I scale includes 127 while the Tc scale includes the remaining 23 of the total 150 items. Damm also found a
considerable amount of overlapping of interscale items. Each of the scales, excluding the Tc scale, overlaps with the I scale with the exception of from 0 to 3 items per scale. Therefore, Damm concluded that since the I scale overlaps most heavily with all other scales, it would appear that this scale should most likely represent an overall measure of the POI. Since the structure of the inventory does not dictate which is the most effective in providing an overall measure of self-actualization, a question of Damm's study was whether the inner directed (I) scale is the most accurate and efficient measurement of self-actualization. Knapp (1965) shed first light on this concern by maintaining that "for present purposes, the I scale (inner directed) scores were used as the best single estimate of self-actualization." Shostrøm (1966) also claimed that "when a quick estimate is desired of the examinees level of self-actualization, or when scores are being used for correlational or statistical analysis, the time competence (Tc) and inner directed (I) scales only may be scored." Such is the case in this study.

The Personal Orientation Inventory has been the subject of many studies related to validity. The trend of this research increasingly gives evidence of its validity. Shostrøm's initial validation studies were established by administering the inventory to six hundred and fifty
freshmen at Los Angeles State College, fifty therapy patients, seventy-five sensitivity group members at U.C.L.A., and fifteen Orange County, California school psychologists. The results of these studies indicated that the test discriminates between the self-actualized, normal, and non-self-actualized groups on all scales with the exception of the nature of man.

The concurrent validity of the POI has been studied using many varying populations. McClain (1970) offered evidence that POI can measure self-actualization among normal adults. Fox et al. (1968), in a similar study using psychiatric patients, found that his sample had significantly lower scores than those found in a self-actualized, a normal, and a non-self-actualized group. When comparing the POI with other instruments purporting to measure similar traits, Shostrom and Knapp (1966) found that correlations of scores on POI and the MMPI were generally consistent and significant. They concluded that although the two instruments do not measure exactly the same aspect of mental health, certain meaningful scale relationships do exist. Grossack et al. (1966), who studied the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, found sixteen correlates of self-actualization.

As Rohaly (1971) notes, reliability studies are not numerous. She states that a possible reason for this is that self-actualization is viewed as a developmental
process which makes the establishment of reliability difficult since change in the direction of psychological health would be considered normal and desirable.

Shostrom (1964) established reliability through test-retest methods. Test-retest reliability coefficients have been obtained for Personal Orientation Inventory Scales based on a sample of forty-eight undergraduate college students. The inventory was administered two times, a week apart, to the sample with the explanation that it was part of the experiment to take the inventory twice. Reliability coefficients were reported of .71 and .77 respectively for the major scales of time competence and inner-direction and coefficients for the sub-scales ranging from .52 to .82. In general, the correlations obtained in this study are at a level commensurate with other personality inventories.

Career Assessment Form

The first Career Assessment Form (CAF) was originally developed by Goodson (1970) to measure degree of commitment to an educational choice. In keeping with the assumption that educational and occupational choices are not necessarily synonymous, an additional item was added by Carney (1973) and Shepherd (1972) to measure committedness to an occupational choice. The CAF requires that the
respondent rank himself on a continuum ranging from "no career choice", to "tentative career choice", to "final career choice".

Goodson's rationale for developing this type of item was based upon recent trends in career development theory. Many theorists of vocational choice—particularly those of the developmental and decision making orientation (e.g., Hershenson, 1968; Ivey and Morrill, 1968; Knoll et al, 1970; Morrill and Forrest, 1970;) --stress the process quality of career decisions. In this viewpoint, career commitments are described as covering a range from "no commitment", to "tentative commitment", to "final commitment". Accordingly, it is proposed that research on the career decision process must take into account this range of commitment possibilities. It should also be noted that this type of item avoids the possibility of "false positive" and "false negative" answers (e.g., saying "yes" or "no" but meaning "tentatively decided") associated with either--or, yes or no, questions.

Sources on both items (educational and occupational) are derived on a 1 to 5 basis with 1 representing "undecided" about a college major and an occupation and 5 representing "decided" on both. Shepherd (1972) found that University of Utah students enrolled in Introduction to Sociology class (N=25) during the summer quarter, 1971 had
a CAF mean of 3.63. The test-retest correlation of .89 has been established at the University of Utah (Carney, 1972). Goodson (1969) reported a mean score of 2.74 for vocationally undecided college students at Brigham Young University. The group mean score after several forms of treatment had increased to 3.62. A complete copy of the CAF may be found in Appendix B.

Career Maturity Inventory

Both the Career Assessment Form (Goodson, 1970) and the Career Maturity Inventory (Crites, 1973) were used to measure the career development variable of this study.

The Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) was formerly entitled the Vocational Development Inventory (Crites, 1965) (VDI) and many of the references cited are to the VDI. The change in name was made for several reasons. First, it reflects the current emphasis on career education that is a parallel process to career development. Second, "career" does not have some of the specialized meanings that are associated with "vocational"; it symbolizes a new point of departure and value system in preparing everyone to play a meaningful and productive role in the marketplace. Thirdly, "maturity" captures and conveys the concept of progressive change which underlies emerging career awareness exploration and decision making - the variables which the CMI has been constructed to measure.
The CMI was developed by Crites (1973) "... to elicit the attitudinal or dispositional response tendencies in vocational maturity which are non-intellective in nature, but which may mediate both choice behavior and choice aptitudes." The items on the test were developed from a combination of the best features of the empirical and rational methods of test construction. A copy of the CMI is contained in Appendix C.

The Attitude Scale of the CMI consists of 50 true-false items. With the exception of seven items (2, 22, 38, 42, 45, 46, 47) for which the correct response is "true", the correct response is "false." Stated another way, the profile for the "vocationally mature" individual would include 43 items marked "false" and seven items marked "true". To support this rational, Crites (73) cited evidence to indicate that the higher the S's grade level, the more they are inclined to answer "false" to the items with the exception of the seven items listed above. Conversely, the lower the S's grade levels, the more educational and life experiences the individual has, the more vocationally mature he is likely to be.

Crites (1973) summarized the research on the CMI:

The Attitude Scale of the Career Maturity Inventory differentiates the responses of fifth through thirteen grades, all of its items being monotonically related to age and grade, with which the total CMI score correlates .46. There is about 35 percent overlap in total scores between
adjacent grades. The test-retest stability coefficient for 1 year is .70.

Teacher Preference Schedule

The Teacher Preference Schedule (Stern, 1960) (TPS) was developed in order to assess the motives and perceptions related to teaching as a career and was selected to measure the educational variable in this study. It is assumed that there are a number of different personal motives and perceptions which teaching may serve to fulfill. The manner in which these motives are actually expressed in classroom behavior is presumed to depend on two further factors: (1) The existence of congruent personality characteristics which determine the kinds of relationships a teacher will sustain with pupils and (2) The acceptance of a supporting ideology which provides the teacher with the justification for behavior which gratifies the underlying motive. This two-way classification based on motive and attitude offers a basis for the more precise identification of teaching style (Stern, 1963).

Two scales were developed for the measurement of gratification (motive) and attitudes (perceptions) associated with ten different teaching roles. Both the gratification and attitude measures alternately developed consist of 100 items distributed in blocks of ten. The items employed in these scales were derived from statements made
by actual teachers identified as prototypes of these roles. The gratification form requires responses to be made on a six point scale, ranging from "strong dislike, disapproval" to "strong likeing, preference, approval." The attitude form is also based on a six-point scale ranging from "strong disagreement" to "strong agreement." Five factors identifying teaching style are then derived from these two scales (gratification and attitude) providing scoring ranges of 0-300 for Factor I and IV, 0-350 for Factors II and III and 0-100 for Factor V. The following are descriptions and scoring categories for the five factors:

Factor I - **Task-Oriented Pragmatist** - The role dimensions are primarily teacher-oriented, weighing pedagogical procedures largely in terms of their contribution to the teacher's well-being and efficiency rather than by their contribution to the pupil. Implication is that what's good for the teacher should be good for the class, but the pupils welfare is not of central concern.

Factor II - **Affection-Seeking** - This is also teacher-centered insofar as it reflects a concern for winning acceptance, love, admiration and recognition. Unlike Factor I there is considerable attention given the pupil, but it involves non-manipulative techniques most likely to insure a strong positive effective response from them towards the teacher.
Factor III - Dependency Needs - This is associated with teachers seeking reassurance and support from the people they recognize as their superiors.

Factor IV - Vicarious Youth Leader - Main thrust of this factor is towards the gaining of student acceptance by being one of them, sharing their idiom, taking up their causes, respecting their dignity and loving them. Manifest behavior of these teachers should be strongly pupil-oriented.

Factor V - Professional Spokesman - This factor reflects a reformist commitment, in this case towards teachers rather than pupils. The concern here is with the improvement of working conditions rather than of educational practices.

The TPS was initially administered (Stern, 1960) to three groups of subjects. The first consisted of 105 freshmen at the Cortland State Teachers College. The second was composed of 42 seniors, all female, in the School of Education at Syracuse University, and, finally, to 98 teachers enrolled in summer session graduate education courses at Syracuse University. Three to four weeks after taking the test, these groups were requested to complete the scales again. One hundred and sixty of the original two hundred and fifty-five returned the answer sheet. The test-retest reliability of the five factors for this group of 160 is shown below in Table I.
TABLE 1

Test-Retest Reliability of the Five Factors of
The Teacher Preference Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TPS is an unpublished instrument in which the validity and reliability checks are few; and a general lack of empirical information exists. Although not a completely validated measure, the TPS was judged appropriate for use in this study. Special permission for its use in this study was received from Dr. Stern's office at Syracuse University (personal communication, January, 1975). A copy of the Teacher Preference Schedule will be found in Appendix D.

Treatment

Freshman Early Experience Program (FEEP)

FEEP is a pre-professional, experience centered teacher education program that gives students, who show an interest in teaching, a core of exploratory experiences in the classroom during the beginning of their university
program. Three major goals of the FEEP are to provide students an opportunity to explore their educational, career, and personal development in order to promote personal and professional development.

A Student involved in the FEEP participates in:

**Teacher Aide Work** - Contact with teachers, public school students, administrators, and other public school personnel for four half-days per week during winter quarter, in order to explore teaching as a career. Five hours of credit are given for this field experience.

**Seminar** - Focus on teacher-learning process, interaction with program coordinator and other university public school, as well as fellow students. Three hours of credit is given for a two hour seminar once a week.

The FEEP represents one attempt on the part of The Ohio State University to meet the needs of freshman and sophomore students entering the university who intend to pursue Education as a major.

**Career Life Planning Seminar**

The Career Life Planning Seminar (CLPS) is a three-credit hour course for vocationally uncommitted or undecided college undergraduates. This informational treatment is designed to be administered over a period of ten weeks in ten, two-hour segments.
The Career Life Planning Seminar presents the student information about the world of work and his own work-relevant characteristics within the framework recommended by Campbell, et al. (1973):

a) Information about majors and work;
b) How to gather information on one's own;
c) How to evaluate such information and use it in decision making;
d) Skills in acquiring a job.

This information is presented through a teaching and learning mode which falls within the affective domain of receiving, responding, and valuing (Krathwohl, et al. 1964). The Career Life Planning Seminar is a Deliberate Psychological Education approach designed to meet the developmental needs of the subjects to move toward eventual commitment to personally valued career goals. An outline of student activities is included in Appendix E.

The CLPS was constructed in small groups of six to eight students. The group leaders were trained by two supervisors to conduct group discussions and exercises. Group leaders were graduate students in Counseling Psychology, Guidance and Counseling, and Student Personnel Work and receive a standard amount of practicum or independent study credit for their participation in the program. All group leaders receive introduction to career development theory
and training in the cognitive and affective procedures of the Career Life Planning Seminar.

Procedure

During Winter Quarter, 1975, three hundred freshman and sophomore students were randomly assigned to one of eight sections within the Freshman Early Experience Programs by the university registrar. Four of these sections, a total of one hundred and twenty-eight students, were randomly selected for use in this study. Their participation in the study was included as part of their educational training experiences. Sixty-four of these students, two sections, received the experiences of the Freshman Early Experience Program only and were designated as Group I. The other two sections of sixty-four students received the Career Life Planning Seminar in addition to the experiences of FEEP and were designated as Group II. The Career Life Planning Seminar was described to students as a class for developing career decision-making skills, and because of the added work load, Group II was given three extra hours of credit.

An attempt was made to establish control group comprised of students expecting to enroll in the Freshman Early Experience Program (FEEP) but receiving neither of two treatments nor combinations of the two treatments.
Unfortunately, it was impossible to obtain such a group as students enrolled in the FEEP program could not be identified until one week prior to their actual participation in the program. By this time it was too late to make arrangements for a portion of these students not to take the FEEP experience until a later date and thus act as a control group for this study. It was decided not to attempt to form a substitute control group from another population similar in variables such as sex, age, grade level of the students in the FEEP program as any significance or non-significance found in the results could be attributed to the differences in the population between the treatment groups and the control groups.

Group I was comprised of thirteen male freshmen, ten female freshmen, and nineteen female sophomores. As can be seen, Group I and Group II are relatively balanced in respect to sex and grade level producing desired control for these variables. The age range of all subjects in this study was between eighteen and twenty one. Both groups were pretested during the first week of the quarter and post tested during the tenth week of the quarter on all instruments described earlier in this chapter.

Because the Career Life Planning Seminar is carried out within small groups, subjects within Group II were broken down into ten groups of six or seven in each group. These groups were formed to be as equivalent or balanced
in regard to sex and grade-level (freshman, sophomore) as possible. Each small group remained intact throughout the quarter, and met two hours, once a week for ten weeks with a trained group leader, in addition to participating in the Freshman Early Experience Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Treatment Sequence</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A + B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-Participation in Freshman Early Experience Program
B-Participation in Career Life Planning Seminar

Hypotheses

This study addresses the question: Can a structured career development experience (Career Life Planning Seminar) significantly increase the degree of personal, career, and educational development of students enrolled in a pre-professional, experience-centered, teacher education program (FEEP) as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory, the Career Maturity Inventory, the Career Assessment Form, and the Teacher Preference Schedule.

More specifically, the hypotheses to be tested are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Subjects in the FEEP experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group (Group II) will be significantly higher in their level of personal
development as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory than subjects in the FEEP experience only group (Group I).

**Hypothesis 2:** Subjects in the FEEP experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group (Group II) will be significantly higher in their level of career development as measured by the Career Maturity Inventory and the Career Assessment Form than subjects in the FEEP experience only group (Group I).

**Hypothesis 3:** Subjects in the FEEP experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group (Group II) will be significantly higher in their level of educational development as measured by the Teacher Preference Schedule than subjects in the FEEP experience only group (Group I).

**Analysis of Data**

As it is the comparative effectiveness of two types of treatment which is of interest, the major summary statistics to be compared are group means on outcome measures. An analysis of variance was used to determine the main and interaction effects. Post hoc group mean comparisons, using Tukey A post hoc analysis was made to locate which treatment group contributed to the significant difference if any.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results of the analysis of the data are presented in this chapter. An analysis of variance was used to determine the main and interaction effects of the two types of treatment in this study. In addition to the F tests from the analyses, the cell means for each group across time are presented to facilitate discussion of trends. The results are presented according to the hypotheses posed in Chapter III. For purpose of analysis, the hypotheses are stated in null form.

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the level of personal development as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) between subjects in the FEEP experience only group (Group I) and the FEEP experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar (CLPS) (Group II).

A two factor fixed design ANOVA was performed on the data from "TC" and "I" scales of the POI to test for any significant differences in personal development between groups. A summary of the means and standard deviations of the POI scores for both groups are found in Table 2.
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Tables 3 and 4 present the results of the ANOVA on the dependent variable of personal development as measured by the POI.

**TABLE 2**

Overall Means and Standard Deviations for Both Groups of Subjects on "To" and "I" Scales of POI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Pre M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Post M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. POI &quot;To&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLFS group</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. POI &quot;I&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>84.34</td>
<td>9.513</td>
<td>86.59</td>
<td>10.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLFS group</td>
<td>80.42</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>84.64</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**

Summary of Analysis of Variance for "To" Scale on POI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1862.50</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>533.19</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Not Significant
Summary of Analysis of Variance for "I" Scale on POI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>552.22</td>
<td>552.22</td>
<td>3.0411</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>669.5</td>
<td>669.5</td>
<td>0.00012</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.01</td>
<td>62.01</td>
<td>1.456</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22880.01</td>
<td>181.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>5265.47</td>
<td>42.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Not Significant

The data indicated no significant main effect or interaction effect differences between the FEEP only group and the FEEP plus CLFS group on the "Tc" scale of the POI (Table 3). There was a significant main effect difference on the pre-post means at p < .01 on the "I" scale of the POI (Table 4), as both groups improved significantly over time in their level of personal development. However, the main effect differences between all subjects in the FEEP only group and the FEEP plus the CLFS was not significant on this "I" scale and neither were the interactional effects between groups over time. Overall, data were not found to warrant the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the level of career development as measured by the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) and the Career Assessment Form (CAF) between subjects in the FEEP experience only group (Group I) and the FEEP experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar (CLFS) (Group II).
A two factor fixed design ANOVA was performed on the data from the CMI and the "Occupation" and "major" scales of the CAF to test for any significant differences in career development between groups. A summary of the means and standard deviations of the CMI and both scales of the CAF are found in Table 5. Table 6, 7, and 8 present results of the ANOVA on the dependent variables of career development as measured by the CMI and the CAF.

### TABLE 5

**Overall Means and Standard Deviations for Both Groups of Subjects on CMI and the "Occ." and Major Scales of the CAF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Pre M</th>
<th>Pre SD</th>
<th>Post M</th>
<th>Post SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. CMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>39.04</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLPS group</td>
<td>38.43</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CAF &quot;Occupation&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLPS group</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CAF &quot;Major&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLPS group</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6
Summary of Analysis of Variance on CMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.941</td>
<td>5.941</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3972.80</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1059.80</td>
<td>8.411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Not Significant

### TABLE 7
Summary of Analysis of Variance for "Occup." Scale on CAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.80</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>43.96</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Not Significant

### TABLE 8
Summary of Analysis of Variance for "Major" Scale on CAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (g)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>103.92</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>43.98</td>
<td>.3490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Not Significant
There were no significant main effect or interaction effect differences between the FEEP only group and the FEEP plus CLPS group on the CNI (Table 6), or on the "Major" scale of the CAF (Table 8). There were no main effect differences on the "Occupation" scale of the CAF (Table 7). There was, however, a significant interaction effect between groups over time on the "Occupation" scale of the CAF (Table 7). Further Analysis using the Tukey - A post hoc test for mean differences indicated that the subjects in the FEEP plus the CLPS group were significantly more decided in regard to future occupation, as a result of the added treatment, than the subjects in the FEEP only group. This significant interaction effect is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1.

Graph of Significant Interaction Effect G x T

\[ G_1 - G_2 \]

\[ G_2 - G_1 \]

G1 = FEEP only
G2 = FEEP + CLPS
Because there was a significant difference found between the FEEP only group and the FEEP plus the CLPS group on the "Occup." scale of the CAF this null hypothesis cannot be totally accepted.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in the level of educational development as measured by the Teacher Preference Schedule (TPS) between subjects in the FEEP experience only group (Group 1) and the FEEP experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar (CLPS) (Group 2).

A two factor fixed design ANOVA was performed on the data from the five scales of the TPS to test for any significant difference in educational development between groups. A summary of the means and standard deviations of the TPS scores for both groups are found in Table 9.

Tables 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 present the results of ANOVA on the dependent variable of educational development as measured by the five scales of the TPS.

TABLE 9

Overall Means and Standard Deviations for Both Groups of Subjects on the Five Scales of the TPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TPS &quot;Task Oriented&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>130.31</td>
<td>31.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLPS group</td>
<td>143.62</td>
<td>31.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TPS &quot;Affection&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>240.39</td>
<td>40.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLPS group</td>
<td>234.59</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9 (Continued)

Overall Means and Standard Deviations for Both Groups of Subjects on the Five Scales of the TRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Pre M</th>
<th>Pre SD</th>
<th>Post M</th>
<th>Post SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. TPS &quot;Dependency&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>193.43</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>29.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLPS group</td>
<td>201.56</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>192.03</td>
<td>35.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TPS &quot;Youthleader&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>188.20</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>191.85</td>
<td>38.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLPS group</td>
<td>186.69</td>
<td>37.65</td>
<td>193.73</td>
<td>29.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TPS &quot;Professional Spokesman&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP only group</td>
<td>64.51</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEP+CLPS group</td>
<td>63.09</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10

Summary of Analysis of Variance for "Task-Orient" Scale on TPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6868.26</td>
<td>6868.26</td>
<td>4.4537</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>625.00</td>
<td>625.00</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>558.14</td>
<td>558.14</td>
<td>1.1432</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1943094.0</td>
<td>1542.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>61514.8</td>
<td>488.213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Not Significant
TABLE 11
Summary of Analysis of Variance for "Affection" Scale on TPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>591.09</td>
<td>591.09</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1615.03</td>
<td>1615.03</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>486.75</td>
<td>486.75</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>269023.4</td>
<td>2135.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>139400.7</td>
<td>1106.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Not Significant

TABLE 12
Summary of Analysis of Variance for "Dependency" Scale on TPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1832.9</td>
<td>1832.9</td>
<td>2.9790</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>183.94</td>
<td>183.94</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>176982.6</td>
<td>1404.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>77523.64</td>
<td>615.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Not Significant

TABLE 13
Summary of Analysis of Variance for "Vicarious Youth" Scale of TPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1832.9</td>
<td>1832.9</td>
<td>2.9790</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>183.94</td>
<td>183.94</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>176982.6</td>
<td>1404.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>77523.64</td>
<td>615.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 14**

Summary of Analysis of Variance for "Professional Spokesman" Scale on TPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1406.25</td>
<td>1406.25</td>
<td>0.0607</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (T)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7439.06</td>
<td>7439.06</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G x T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22876.56</td>
<td>22876.56</td>
<td>2.1737</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2918187.5</td>
<td>23160.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1326084.4</td>
<td>10524.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A main effect difference between all subjects in the FEEP only group and all subjects in the FEEP plus CLFS group was significant at p. < .05 on the "Task Orient." scale of the TPS also with a significant main effect difference on the pre-post means at the p. < .01 on the "Dependency" scale of the TPS. However, the data indicated no significant main effect or interaction effect differences between the FEEP only group and the FEEP plus the CLFS group on the "Affection", "Vicarious Youth", and "Professional Spokesman" scales of the TPS (Tables 11, 13, 14). There were no significant interaction effects on any of the five scales of the TPS. Thus this null hypotheses was not rejected.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary of Results

In general, the hypotheses of this study were not supported. There were no significant differences found in the level of personal development as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory (Hypothesis 1); in the level of career development as measured by the Career Maturity Inventory and the "Major" scale of the Career Assessment (Hypothesis 2); or in the level of educational development as measured by the Teacher Preference Schedule (Hypothesis 3) between subjects in the F.E.E.P. experience only group (Group I) and the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar Group (Group II).

There was one exception to the overall lack of significance found between groups. The F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group (Group II) was significantly different in a positive direction in respect to the "Occupation" scale of the Career Assessment Form.
(Table 7) than the F.E.E.P. experience only group (Group I). In other words, Group II became more committed over time to their future occupation than did Group I. This suggested that the Career Life Planning Seminar did have some significant effect on the career development (Hypothesis 2) of the F.E.E.P. student, however, this one exception is not sufficient to support this hypothesis or the other hypotheses of the study.

The purpose of this study was to examine the intervention effect of the Career Life Planning Seminar on the personal, career, and educational development of students enrolled in the Freshman Early Experience Program. It was not designed to assess the effect of the F.E.E.P. experience as such, on the students involved in the program, although a control group comprised of students expecting to enroll in the Freshman Early Experience Program but receiving neither of the two treatments or combinations of the two treatments could have provided comparison results. It was impossible to obtain such a control group, however, for reasons that were discussed earlier in Chapter III. Except for the "Occupation" scale of the CAF there was no indication of change in the pre-post measures for either the F.E.E.P. experience only group (Group I) on the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar (Group II). It would be expected that if there had been such a control
group, no difference between groups would have been found. In other words, no real change apparently took place in the level of personal, career, and educational development of the students enrolled in the Freshman Early Experience Program as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory, the Career Maturity Inventory, the Career Assessment Form, or the Teacher Preference Schedule.

**Discussion of Results**

Although no real change apparently occurred in the level of personal, career, and educational development of students in Freshman Early Experience Programs as a result of the F.E.E.P. experience alone or the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar, this is not unusual in relationship to the previous research discussed in Chapter II. There was no solid empirical evidence found to suggest that similar experience-centered, teacher-training programs resulted in significant change of student attitudes in respect to teaching. Any mention of success of these programs was subjective in nature and difficult to evaluate. Furthermore, more comprehensive measures were used in the present study than in previous studies, yet the results still came out negative. Thus the overall negative results found in this study are not surprising when viewed in light of previous research.
It is also possible that the instruments chosen to measure the personal, career and educational development of the F.E.E.P. students were not sensitive to the specific behavioral and attitudinal changes which occurred as a result of the F.E.E.P. experience alone and the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar. As the results generally indicate, there is little variance of scores observed between the two groups over time on any of the four measures except the "Occupation" scale of the Career Assessment Form. One would expect more variance of scores between groups over time if the instruments were appropriate for the concepts they were measuring. This was especially true for the Teacher Preference Schedule where between and within group scores varied very little.

As discussed in Chapter III, the Freshman Early Experience Program is a pre-professional, experienced-centered, teaching training program which helps students decide, through a self-selection process, whether teaching is, or is not, appropriate for them. All students in the F.E.E.P have tentatively selected education as a proposed major and are required to participate in the experiences of the F.E.E.P. program. Thus, students enter the F.E.E.P. program with an already high mental set of pre-commitment to teaching. This can be observed by the very high commitment scores on both scales of pre tests of the Career
Assessment Form (Table 4). Thus, even if the students did improve on this measure, there was little room for improvement or change. This issue could offer possible explanation as to the overall negative results of this study as students who have tentatively selected education as a potential major or occupation already possess a commitment to teaching making it difficult to measure any significant effect between the two treatments in this study.

As indicated by the results, there was bery little difference found in the level of personal, career, and educational development between F.E.E.P. students in the F.E.E.P. only group and the F.E.E.P. plus the Career Life Planning Seminar as measured by the POI, CMI, CAF, and TPS respectively. Although there were few significant between group differences, there were some large individual score differences which are not readily apparent in the results of this study. For example, in respect to scores on the Career Maturity Inventory, there were from four to eight subjects in both groups (Group I and Group II) whose raw scores varied as much as from 8 to 10 or from 50 to 60 percentile points from pre to post measures. The direction of the changes, however, evened out resulting in little if any differences in group mean scores. A program such as the Freshman Early Experience Program should expect such differential effects. Some students get "turned on" toward
teaching while others get "turned off" toward teaching. This is the purpose of the self-selection aspect of F.E.E.P. It is difficult to know, however, whether large individual changes in scores are due to lack of reliability of the instruments or due to real individual differential change. This becomes an important consideration for future research as this study was not designed to investigate individual difference changes and reflect their meaning.

In summary, the evidence presented in this study suggests that the Career Life Planning Seminar had little effect on the personal, career, and educational goals of the F.E.E.P. students as there was little significant difference found in regard to these goals between F.E.E.P. students in the F.E.E.P. experience only group and the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group. However, possible explanations of the results were discussed and should be considered in light of the limitations of this study which follow.

Limitations of the Study

A major limitation of the present study is the lack of a control group comprised of students expecting to enroll in the Freshman Early Experience Program (F.E.E.P.) but receiving neither of the two treatments nor combinations of the two treatments. This study assumed that the F.E.E.P. experience alone may significantly improve the education,
career, and personal development of the F.E.E.P. students although the purpose of this study was not to substantiate or disprove the assumptions. However, a control group such as this would have enabled examination of the significance or nonsignificance of the F.E.E.P. experience alone and possibly explain some of the overall lack of significance found between the F.E.E.P. experience alone group and the F.E.E.P. plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group. Unfortunately, it was impossible to obtain this group, as students enrolled in the F.E.E.P. program could not be identified until one week prior to their actual participation in the program. By this time it was too late to make arrangements for a portion of these students not to take the F.E.E.P. experience (Treatment I) until a later date. It was decided not to attempt to use a group similar in age, sex, and grade level to the students in the F.E.E.P. program as a control group such as this would not be comparable except on a limited number of variables.

Although attempts were made to equalize and/or balance the two groups in regard to sex and grade level, the lack of more complete control of these variables is another limitation of this study. The format for acquiring this more complete control would be to equally divide the individuals in the study on the basis of their sex and grade level into the F.E.E.P. only group and the F.E.E.P. plus
the Career Life Planning Seminar (C.L.P.S.) group. Both groups would be pre and post tested on all of the measures used in this study. An analysis of variance could then be done establishing sex and grade level as independent variables. If sex and grade interact with either of the two treatment groups, one would expect that there would be significant sex-grade level and treatment interactions in the pre-post comparisons on the dependent measures. The lack of more complete control of these variables might have effected the very minimal significant difference found between the F.E.E.P. only group and F.E.E.P. plus C.L.P.S. group in this study.

Current research (Crites, 1969; 1971; Spielberger, 1971; Mosher and Sprinthal, 1971; Shostrom, 1963) indicates that individuals vary considerably in their degrees of career decidedness, vocational maturity, and personal development at different age and grade levels. This suggests that the Career Life Planning Seminar may not have been developmentally timely for a substantial portion of the subjects. It is conceivable that, because of this factor, few significant changes were evidenced in the subjects in the F.E.E.P. and C.L.P.S. group, thus producing another limiting factor of this study.

The Teacher Preference Schedule (Stern, 1960) which was used to measure the educational developmental of
the F.E.E.P. student is limiting in numerous ways. First of all, the instrument has been little used since its development in 1960 and its reliability and validity checks are few. Secondly, the TPS's ability to measure perceptions and motives in regard to the teaching field was not substantiated in this study. The variance of scores between groups over time was small on all of the five scales of the TPS. Finally, the Teacher Preference Schedule is an awkward instrument to administer, take, score, and analyze, probably due to its lack of refinement and use over the years. Because of this, it is an impractical instrument to use in this kind of research.

Another limitation of this study stems from the extreme vagueness of the goals of the Freshman Early Experience Program. The F.E.E.P. program purports to increase the personal, career, and educational development of the F.E.E.P. student. These concepts are extremely broad and vague, thus making it difficult to identify specifics within each concept that are measurable. In this study, personal, career, and educational development were defined in respect to the specific instrument chosen to measure them. Possibly, other instruments would be more appropriate and/or sensitive to these three types of student development than the ones chosen for use in this study.
Finally, the Freshman Early Experience Program and the Career Life Planning Seminar are both courses offered for credit by the university. As such, the study is field research and the delivery of both treatments reflect being given by different group leaders, in different rooms, at different times of the day, and to different sized groups.

**Implications for Further Research.**

The most obvious implications for future research is replication without the restrictive limitations of the present study.

As discussed earlier, no true empirical evidence exists that supports the success or failure of various early-experiencing, teacher-training programs. Although the results of this study were found to be negative overall, this does not suggest that the Freshman Early Experience Program is a worthless program. Theoretically, the F.E.E.P. program at Ohio State University, and similar programs around the nation, are quite sound, but, further controlled research is needed before any specific evaluations of such programs can be made.

In programs such as the Freshman Early Experience Program and the Career Life Planning Seminar, the individual variation in response to the program can be very significant. Impact of such programs vary widely in degree and nature as well as direction. Evaluation of such programs
In terms of single variables between groups does not necessarily supply the full picture. If individual differences did take place they tend to cancel or balance one another out and are not readily apparent when observing between group differences. Further research needs to be done to adequately assess these differences and measure the effect they have on structured career oriented programs as the ones mentioned above. An intensive case study approach might be one way to measure individual differences and relate these differences to the overall value and effectiveness of such programs.

Crites (1969, 1971) and Spielberger (1971) suggest that individuals vary considerably in their degree of career decidedness, vocational maturity, and personal development at different age and grade levels. As mentioned previously the Career Life Planning Seminar may not have been developmentally timely for a substantial portion of the subjects in this study. Possibly examining the intervention effects of the C.L.P.S. in regard to these criteria at different age and grade levels (elementary, secondary, and graduate levels) might produce more significant results than those found in this study.

In regard to Mosher and Sprinthal (1971) Deliberate Psychological Model of "learning by doing" it would seem reasonable to train the students in the F.E.E.P. program
in the dynamics and concepts of the Career Life Planning Workshop and then have them deliver the C.L.P.S. to high school sophomores, juniors, and seniors as part of their teaching-experiential training. It would be interesting to examine if this "learning by doing" model would have a significantly greater effect on the level of career and personal development of students who were actually delivering the C.L.P.S. versus students who were merely taking the C.L.P.S. as a course not related to their teaching experience.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

This dissertation examines the intervention effect of a structured career development experience (Career Life Planning Seminar) on the personal, career, and educational goals of freshman and sophomore students enrolled in a pre-professional, experience-centered teacher education program (Freshman Early Experience Program). One hundred and twenty-eight students within the F.E.E.P. program were randomly assigned to one of two treatment groups with attempts made to balance the groups in regard to their sex and grade level. Sixty-four of these students received the experiences of the Freshman Early Experience Program only and designated as Group I. The remaining sixty-four students received the experiences of the Career Life Planning Seminar in addition to the experiences of F.E.E.P. and designated as Group II. However, it was not feasible to form a control group that had no training.

It was hypothesized that while the experiential program alone (F.E.E.P.) may significantly improve the personal, career, and educational development of the students within
the F.E.E.P. program, the experiential program plus the Career Life Planning Seminar (the intervention) will best facilitate these three aspects of student development.

More specifically the hypotheses that were tested are as follows:

**Hypothesis 1** - Subjects in the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group (Group II) will be significantly higher in their level of personal development as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory than subjects in the F.E.E.P. experience only group. (Group I).

**Hypothesis 2** - Subjects in the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group (Group II) will be significantly higher in their level of career development as measured by the Career Maturity Inventory and the Career Assessment Form than subjects in the F.E.E.P. experience only group (Group I).

**Hypothesis 3** - Subjects in the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group (Group II) will be significantly higher in their level of educational development as measured by the Teacher Preference Schedule than subjects in the F.E.E.P. experience only group (Group I).

In general, the hypotheses of this study were not supported. There were no significant differences found in the level of personal development as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory (Hypothesis I), in the level of...
career development as measured by the Career Maturity Inventory and the "Major" scale of the Career Assessment Form, (Hypothesis 2), or in the level of educational development as measured by the Teacher Preference Schedule (Hypothesis 3) between subjects in the F.E.E.P. experience only group (Group I) and the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group (Group II).

There was one exception to the overall lack of significance found between groups. The F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar group (Group II) was significantly different in a positive direction in respect to the "Occupation" scale of the Career Assessment Form than the F.E.E.P. experience only group (Group I). In other words, Group II became more committed over time to their future occupation than did Group I. This suggests that the Career Life Planning Seminar did have some significant effect on the career development (Hypothesis 2) of the F.E.E.P. student. This one exception, however, is not sufficient to support this hypothesis or any of the hypotheses of the study.

Possible explanation of the results were discussed. It was found that no solid empirical evidence existed to suggest that similar experience-centered, teacher-training programs such as F.E.E.P. brought about significant changes in student attitudes in regard to teaching. Thus, the overall negative results found in this study are not surprising
when viewed in the light of previous research. It was also possible that the instruments chosen to measure the personal, career, and educational development of the F.E.E.P. students were not sensitive to the specific behavioral and attitude changes incurred as a result of the F.E.E.P. experience alone and the F.E.E.P. experience plus the Career Life Planning Seminar and other measures might be more appropriate. Finally, the significance of individual variation of differences in regard to structured career programs was discussed. Evaluation of such programs in terms of single variables between groups does not provide a true picture of individual change, thus future research needs to assess these individual changes before an adequate evaluation of such programs can occur.
APPENDIX A

PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY (POI)
PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

EVERETT L. SHOSTROM, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of pairs of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide which of the two paired statements most consistently applies to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If the first statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "a". (See Example Item 1 at right.) If the second statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "b". (See Example Item 2 at right.) If neither statement applies to you, or if they refer to something you don't know about, make no answer on the answer sheet. Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself and do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks in this booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

Before you begin the inventory, be sure you put your name, your sex, your age, and the other information called for in the space provided on the answer sheet.

NOW OPEN THE BOOKLET AND START WITH QUESTION 1.
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1. a. I am bound by the principle of fairness.
   b. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.

2. a. When a friend does me a favor, I feel that I must return it.
   b. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.

3. a. I feel I must always tell the truth.
   b. I do not always tell the truth.

4. a. No matter how hard I try, my feelings are often hurt.
   b. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.

5. a. I feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
   b. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.

6. a. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
   b. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.

7. a. I am afraid to be myself.
   b. I am not afraid to be myself.

8. a. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
   b. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.

9. a. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
   b. I do not feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.

10. a. I live by values which are in agreement with others.
    b. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.

11. a. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
    b. I am not concerned with self-improvement at all times.

12. a. I feel guilty when I am selfish.
    b. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.

13. a. I have no objection to getting angry.
    b. Anger is something I try to avoid.

14. a. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
    b. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.

15. a. I put others' interests before my own.
    b. I do not put others' interests before my own.

16. a. I sometimes feel embarrassed by compliments.
    b. I am not embarrassed by compliments.

17. a. I believe it is important to accept others as they are.
    b. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.

18. a. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
    b. I don't put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.

19. a. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.
    b. I have a right to expect the other person to appreciate what I give.

20. a. My moral values are dictated by society.
    b. My moral values are self-determined.

21. a. I do what others expect of me.
    b. I feel free to not do what others expect of me.

22. a. I accept my weaknesses.
    b. I don't accept my weaknesses.

23. a. In order to grow emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.
    b. In order to grow emotionally, it is not necessary to know why I act as I do.

24. a. Sometimes I am cross when I am not feeling well.
    b. I am hardly ever cross.
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25. a. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.
   b. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.

26. a. I am afraid of making mistakes.
   b. I am not afraid of making mistakes.

27. a. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
   b. I do not trust the decisions I make spontaneously.

   b. My feelings of self-worth do not depend on how much I accomplish.

29. a. I fear failure.
   b. I don't fear failure.

30. a. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.
   b. My moral values are not determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.

31. a. It is possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.
   b. It is not possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.

32. a. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.
   b. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.

33. a. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
   b. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.

34. a. Children should realize that they do not have the same rights and privileges as adults.
   b. It is not important to make an issue of rights and privileges.

35. a. I can "stick my neck out" in my relations with others.
   b. I avoid "sticking my neck out" in my relations with others.

36. a. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.
   b. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.

37. a. I find that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.
   b. I have not rejected any of the moral values I was taught.

38. a. I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.
   b. I do not live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.

39. a. I trust my ability to size up a situation.
   b. I do not trust my ability to size up a situation.

40. a. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
   b. I do not believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.

41. a. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
   b. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.

42. a. I am bothered by fears of being inadequate.
   b. I am not bothered by fears of being inadequate.

43. a. I believe that man is essentially good and can be trusted.
   b. I believe that man is essentially evil and cannot be trusted.

44. a. I live by the rules and standards of society.
   b. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.

45. a. I am bound by my duties and obligations to others.
   b. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.

46. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.
   b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.
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47. a. There are times when just being silent is the best way I can express my feelings.
   b. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.

48. a. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
   b. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.

49. a. I like everyone I know.
   b. I do not like everyone I know.

50. a. Criticism threatens my self-esteem.
   b. Criticism does not threaten my self-esteem.

51. a. I believe that knowledge of what is right makes people act right.
   b. I do not believe that knowledge of what is right necessarily makes people act right.

52. a. I am afraid to be angry at those I love.
   b. I feel free to be angry at those I love.

53. a. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
   b. My basic responsibility is to be aware of others' needs.

54. a. Impressing others is most important.
   b. Expressing myself is most important.

55. a. To feel right, I need always to please others.
   b. I can feel right without always having to please others.

56. a. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is right.
   b. I will not risk a friendship just to say or do what is right.

57. a. I feel bound to keep the promises I make.
   b. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.

58. a. I must avoid sorrow at all costs.
   b. It is not necessary for me to avoid sorrow.

59. a. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.
   b. I do not feel it necessary always to predict what will happen in the future.

60. a. It is important that others accept my point of view.
   b. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.

61. a. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.
   b. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.

62. a. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
   b. There are very few times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.

63. a. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
   b. I do not welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.

64. a. Appearances are all-important.
   b. Appearances are not terribly important.

65. a. I hardly ever gossip.
   b. I gossip a little at times.

66. a. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
   b. I do not feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.

67. a. I should always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
   b. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.

68. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
   b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
69. a. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.
   b. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.

70. a. I hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
   b. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.

71. a. I will continue to grow only by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.
   b. I will continue to grow best by being myself.

72. a. I accept inconsistencies within myself.
   b. I cannot accept inconsistencies within myself.

73. a. Man is naturally cooperative.
   b. Man is naturally antagonistic.

74. a. I don’t mind laughing at a dirty joke.
   b. I hardly ever laugh at a dirty joke.

75. a. Happiness is a by-product in human relationships.
   b. Happiness is an end in human relationships.

76. a. I only feel free to show friendly feelings to strangers.
   b. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.

77. a. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fall.
   b. I try to be sincere and I am sincere.

78. a. Self-interest is natural.
   b. Self-interest is unnatural.

79. a. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.
   b. A neutral party cannot measure a happy relationship by observation.

80. a. For me, work and play are the same.
   b. For me, work and play are opposites.

81. a. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.
   b. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.

82. a. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
   b. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.

83. a. I like only masculine men and feminine women.
   b. I like men and women who show masculinity as well as femininity.

84. a. I actively attempt to avoid embarrassment whenever I can.
   b. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.

85. a. I blame my parents for a lot of my troubles.
   b. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.

86. a. I feel that a person should be silly only at the right time and place.
   b. I can be silly when I feel like it.

87. a. People should always repent their wrongdoings.
   b. People need not always repent their wrongdoings.

88. a. I worry about the future.
   b. I do not worry about the future.

89. a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.
   b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.

90. a. I prefer to save good things for future use.
   b. I prefer to use good things now.

91. a. People should always control their anger.
   b. People should express honestly-felt anger.
92. a. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensual.
   b. The truly spiritual man is never sensual.

93. a. I am able to express my feelings even when
   they sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
   b. I am unable to express my feelings if they are
   likely to result in undesirable consequences.

94. a. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions
   that I feel bubbling up within me.
   b. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.

95. a. I have had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
   b. I have never had mysterious or ecstatic
   experiences.

96. a. I am orthodoxly religious.
   b. I am not orthodoxly religious.

97. a. I am completely free of guilt.
   b. I am not free of guilt.

98. a. I have a problem in fusing sex and love.
   b. I have no problem in fusing sex and love.

99. a. I enjoy detachment and privacy.
   b. I do not enjoy detachment and privacy.

100. a. I feel dedicated to my work.
    b. I do not feel dedicated to my work.

101. a. I can express affection regardless of whether
    it is returned.
    b. I cannot express affection unless I am sure it
    will be returned.

102. a. Living for the future is as important as living
    for the moment.
    b. Only living for the moment is important.

103. a. It is better to be yourself.
    b. It is better to be popular.

104. a. Wishing and imagining can be bad.
    b. Wishing and imagining are always good.

105. a. I spend more time preparing to live.
    b. I spend more time actually living.

106. a. I am loved because I give love.
    b. I am loved because I am lovable.

107. a. When I really love myself, everybody will
    love me.
    b. When I really love myself, there will still be
    those who won't love me.

108. a. I can let other people control me.
    b. I can let other people control me if I am sure
    they will not continue to control me.

109. a. As they are, people sometimes annoy me.
    b. As they are, people do not annoy me.

110. a. Living for the future gives my life its primary
    meaning.
    b. Only living for the future ties into living
    for the present does my life have meaning.

111. a. I follow diligently the motto, "Don't waste your
    time."
    b. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste
    your time."

112. a. What I have been in the past dictates the kind
    of person I will be.
    b. What I have been in the past does not neces­
    sarily dictate the kind of person I will be.

113. a. It is important to me how I live in the here and
    now.
    b. It is of little importance to me how I live in
    the here and now.

114. a. I have had an experience where life seemed
    just perfect.
    b. I have never had an experience where life
    seemed just perfect.

115. a. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to
    be good.
    b. Evil is an intrinsic part of human nature which
    fights good.
116. a. A person can completely change his essential nature.
   b. A person can never change his essential nature.

117. a. I am afraid to be tender.
   b. I am not afraid to be tender.

118. a. I am assertive and affirming.
   b. I am not assertive and affirming.

119. a. Women should be trusting and yielding.
   b. Women should not be trusting and yielding.

120. a. I see myself as others see me.
   b. I do not see myself as others see me.

121. a. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.
   b. A person who thinks about his greatest potential gets conceited.

122. a. Men should be assertive and affirming.
   b. Men should not be assertive and affirming.

123. a. I am able to risk being myself.
   b. I am not able to risk being myself.

124. a. I feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.
   b. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.

125. a. I suffer from memories.
   b. I do not suffer from memories.

126. a. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.
   b. Men and women must not be both yielding and assertive.

127. a. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.
   b. I do not like to participate actively in intense discussions.

128. a. I am self-sufficient.
   b. I am not self-sufficient.

129. a. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
   b. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.

130. a. I always play fair.
   b. Sometimes I cheat a little.

131. a. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.
   b. I never feel so angry that I want to destroy or hurt others.

132. a. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.
   b. I feel uncertain and insecure in my relationships with others.

133. a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
   b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.

134. a. I can accept my mistakes.
   b. I cannot accept my mistakes.

135. a. I find some people who are stupid and uninteresting.
   b. I never find any people who are stupid and uninteresting.

136. a. I regret my past.
   b. I do not regret my past.

137. a. Being myself is helpful to others.
   b. Just being myself is not helpful to others.

138. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.
   b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of bliss.
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139. a. People have an instinct for evil.
    b. People do not have an instinct for evil.
140. a. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.
    b. For me, the future often seems hopeless.
141. a. People are both good and evil.
    b. People are not both good and evil.
142. a. My past is a stepping stone for the future.
    b. My past is a handicap to my future.
143. a. "Killing time" is a problem for me.
    b. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.
144. a. For me, past, present and future is in meaningful continuity.
    b. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.
145. a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.
    b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.
146. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.
    b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.
147. a. People are basically good.
    b. People are not basically good.
148. a. Honesty is always the best policy.
    b. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.
149. a. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.
    b. I feel uncomfortable with anything less than a perfect performance.
150. a. I can overcome any obstacles as long as I believe in myself.
    b. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.
APPENDIX B

CAREER ASSESSMENT FORM (CAP)
Using a check mark ( ), please indicate which one of the following statements best describes you with regard to your choice of an occupation:

☐ I have decided on my occupation - the occupation I have chosen is

☐ I have my occupation narrowed down to a few possibilities - they are

☐ I have tentatively thought about the following possibilities as an occupation

☐ I have a hazy understanding as to which occupational areas I could consider.

☐ I am completely undecided concerning my occupation in the future.

Using a check mark ( ), please indicate which one of the following statements best describes you with regard to your choice of a college major:

☐ I have decided on my college major - the major I have chosen is

☐ I have my major choice narrowed down to a few possibilities - they are

☐ I have tentatively thought about the following possibilities as a major

☐ I have a hazy understanding as to which general areas I could consider.

☐ I am completely undecided concerning my future college major.
APPENDIX C

CAREER MATURITY INVENTORY (CMI)
Print your social security number, your name, sex, and the data on the answer sheet that has been provided.

Your answers to the statements in this inventory are to be recorded on the answer sheet. Do not mark the inventory.

There are a number of statements about occupational choice and work listed in this booklet. Occupational choice means the kind of work that you think you will probably be doing when you finish all of your schooling.

If you agree or mostly agree with the statement, use your pencil to blacken the space under the letter T on your answer sheet. If you disagree or mostly disagree with the statement, blacken the space under the letter F on your answer sheet. Be sure your marks are heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change.

There are fifty statements on this inventory, please respond to all of them.

If you have any questions, please ask them now.
1. Once you choose a job, you can't choose another one.
2. In order to choose a job, you need to know what kind of person you are.
3. I plan to follow the line of work my parents suggest.
4. I guess everybody has to go to work sooner or later, but I don't look forward to it.
5. A person can do any kind of work he wants to as long as he tries hard.
6. I'm not very worried about choosing an occupation until I'm out of school.
7. Your job is important because it determines how much you can earn.
8. Work is worthwhile mainly because it lets you buy the things you want.
9. The greatest appeal of a job to me is the opportunity it provides for getting ahead.
10. I often daydream about what I want to be, but I really haven't chosen a line of work yet.
11. Knowing what you are good at is more important than knowing what you like in choosing an occupation.
12. Your parents probably know better than anybody which occupation you should enter.
13. If I can just help others in my work, I'll be happy.
14. Work is dull and unpleasant.
15. Everyone seems to tell me something different, until now I don't know which kind of work to choose.
16. I don't know how to go about getting into the kind of work I want to do.
17. Why try to decide upon a job when the future is so uncertain.

18. I spend a lot of time wishing I could do work that I know I cannot even possibly do.

19. I don't know what courses I should take in school.

20. It's probably just as easy to be successful in one occupation as it is in another.

21. By the time you are 15, you should have your mind pretty well made up about the occupation you intend to enter.

22. There are so many things to consider in choosing an occupation, it is hard to make a decision.

23. I seldom think about the job I want to enter.

24. It doesn't matter which job you choose as long as it pays well.

25. You can't go very far wrong by following your parents' advice about which job to choose.

26. Working is much like going to school.

27. I am having difficulty in preparing myself for the work I want to do.

28. I know very little about the requirements of jobs.

29. The job I choose has to give me plenty of freedom to do what I want.

30. The best thing to do is to try out several jobs, and then choose the one you like best.

31. There is only one occupation for each person.

32. Whether you are interested in a particular kind of work is not as important as whether you can do it.

33. I can't understand how some people can be so set about what they want to do.

34. As long as I can remember I've know what kind of work I want to do.

35. I want to really accomplish something in my work - to make a great discovery or earn lots of money or help a great number of people.

36. You get into an occupation mostly by chance.
37. It's who you know, not what you know, that's important in a job.
38. When it comes to choosing a job, I'll make up my own mind.
39. Choose an occupation which gives you a chance to help others.
40. When I am trying to study, I often find myself daydreaming about what it will be like when I start working.
41. I have little or no idea of what working will be like.
42. Choose an occupation, then plan how to enter it.
43. I really can't find any work that has much appeal for me.
44. Choose a job in which you can someday become famous.
45. If you have some doubts about what you want to do, ask your parents or friends for advice and suggestions.
46. Choose a job which allows you to do what you believe in.
47. The most important part of work is the pleasure which comes from doing it.
48. I keep changing my occupational choices.
49. As far as choosing an occupation is concerned, something will come along sooner or later.
50. Why worry about choosing a job when you don't have anything to say about it anyway?
TEACHER PREFERENCE SCHEDULE
George G. Stern, Joseph M. Mosting, John Henderson,
Rachel Levin, and Barnett Denton
Syracuse University

The purpose of this schedule is to investigate teachers' feelings about various aspects of teaching. The schedule consists of a number of statements describing many different things teachers are concerned about. Teachers differ in their feelings about these activities and this schedule has been developed as an aid to determining how great and how varied these differences are. It is important that you record your own personal feelings about these matters, even in those cases where you think that other teachers may perhaps feel differently than you do. There are no right answers, these are all matters of opinion, and there are strong arguments for every position represented here.

DIRECTIONS

The special answer sheet will be used to record your answers. Please read the Directions for Using Name Grid in the lower left hand corner of the answer sheet and then fill in the grid using an ordinary soft pencil. Then fill in the rest of the information requested in the center of the answer sheet. The response circles are numbered to correspond to the numbered items on the schedule. Be sure to blacken the appropriate circle matching the item number. To insure proper processing the response circle must be filled in completely, using a soft pencil only. Do not make stray marks, and erase errors completely. Please turn the page and read the directions for Part A.

Copyright 1960, George G. Stern
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TEACHER_PREFERENCE_SCHEDULE (TPS)
PLEASE NOTE:


UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
APPENDIX E

CAREER LIFE-PLANNING SEMINAR
CLASS SYLLABUS
### Student Activities: Career Life Planning Seminar

#### Activities

1. **in-class activity**
2. a: assignment (homework)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Assessment (i, a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to class (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Career decisions (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-Analysis: Role identification and role stripping, (Life Planning) (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career Analysis: Fantasy future work day, (Life Planning) (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal coat of arms (Values Clarification) (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work orientation and job levels (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicting SDS code plus analysis of feelings and values (Transactional Analysis) (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizing feelings and values, commitment to decision making (Transactional Analysis) (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Directed Search (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Discuss SDS and prediction (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career library (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of occupation; worksheet in Resume Workbook plus interview (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Career transition fantasy (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Force-field self analysis plus analysis of feelings and values (Transactional Analysis) (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Force-field analysis, career (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Behavioral goal setting (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Behavioral goal setting (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final paper (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Job placement (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group interview with feedback (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resume (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cover letter (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Practice interview (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Review discussion (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Assessment (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Assessment (i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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