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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Since the initiative placed behind the Career Education concept in 1971 by former U.S. Commissioner of Education Sidney P. Marland,\(^1\) a multitude of educational programs, projects and activities have been undertaken by local, state and federal educational agencies. The current U.S. Secretary of Education (also the former U.S. Commissioner of Education), Terrel H. Bell applauded these efforts in 1974 and stated that the establishment of formal legislation in a number of states is further indication of the efficacy of the concept at all levels.\(^2\)

---


Hoyt\(^3\) has referred to career education as consisting of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about work. Magisos\(^4\) stated that "...career education should be thought of as a comprehensive approach to meeting the needs of individuals at every stage of their career development." In a report by the National Advisory Council on Career Education, several pertinent items of evidence were reported concerning the prominence of career education:\(^5\)

Comprehensive federal legislation which has furthered the goals and objectives of career education are: Part B, Title X of the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318), Occupational Education Programs (unfortunately never funded); and Special Projects Act of the Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380), with authorized funding up to 15 million.

Federal money and public interest in career education have generated substantial activity by state governments. Yet, much remains to be done. For example, while 55 of the 57

\(^3\)Kenneth B. Hoyt, Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences, Distinguished Lecture Series 2, (Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational Education, 1974).


states and territories have appointed career education coordinators, only 27 states use state funds to pay salaries of these coordinators.

While state efforts have reached 2.5 million elementary pupils, 15.5 million elementary pupils have yet to be exposed to career education. Finally, while 44,520 secondary teachers have received in-service development in career education, this represents only 8.4% of the 525,574 employed in 1974.

An initial effort was made to compile career education demographic and implementation data during the First National Conference of Career Education Coordinators in 1974.\(^6\) This initial data collection activity was enhanced by a national survey of the status of career education for school year 1974-1975.\(^7\) While various studies have been initiated, no attempt had been made since 1975 to examine in a comprehensive sense the status of career education or the extent of implementation of the concept as perceived by state level leadership.


In the fall of 1978, the author inquired of the U.S. Office of Career Education as to their intent regarding updating the 1974-75 national survey. While the data were deemed to be of importance for planning purposes, funding levels and competing priorities at the federal level did not make such a survey possible.

Career education, after eight years of public and private investment and a high level of visibility and enthusiastic support, needed to be assessed as to what had been accomplished to date. While the National Institute of Education's 1977 Forward Plan and other local, state and federal reports described selected aspects of the career education effort, no single document or report has described career education efforts nationally or in individual states.

The nature of the funding, content areas emphasized and program status are items of data that are important to arriving at present and future decisions by administrative career education decision-makers at all levels.

---

The specific purpose for this study can be stated: "What did State Coordinators of Career Education perceive to be the most pervasive problems and priorities in implementing career education?"

This study was undertaken to determine the status of career education in 1979 as viewed by state coordinators of career education nationally. This was a critical juncture point in the evolution of career education nationally, given the recent passage of the Career Education Incentive Act (Public Law 94-207) and the potential seen for appropriations in 1979 to support the federal legislation enacted. The passage of the Career Education Incentive Act also triggered the repealing of PL 93-380, Section 406 - "Career Education" which was operable from FY 1974 to FY 1978 as a demonstration program aimed at promoting, communicating and demonstrating the most effective methods and procedures in career education. In addition, each state's federal planning grant was terminated in 1978 and all state plans for career education were required to be submitted to the U.S. Office of Career Education as a basis for future federal support. Several states/territories had undergone or were undergoing a transition with regard to state leadership in terms of personnel, organizational structure, and/or
support bases and arrangements for career education immediately preceding and during the conduct of this study. This appears to have been due in part to the conclusion of state planning support and the extensive delay and cutbacks in FY 1979 appropriations for Public Law 94-207, the Career Education Incentive Act of 1977. The author felt it appropriate to alert the reader to these factors in considering the findings in this study.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study related to determining the state of career education in terms of program status, problems and priorities. Specific objectives were:

1. The extent to which formal mechanisms have been established in states which promote the development and implementation of career education.

2. The total dollars invested in career education by individual states for the 1977-1978 school year.

3. The extent to which school districts have implemented career education.

4. The major constraints/successes experienced by state and local coordinators of career education in the implementation of career education programs.
5. The extent to which career education programs in states are being conceptualized and implemented in accordance with the goals identified by United States Office of Education (USOE).

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they are used in this study.

Career Education—consists of all those activities and experiences through which one learns about work. As such it makes no restrictions in meaning whether one speaks about the work of the homemaker, the musician, the lawyer, or the bricklayer. Some work will require advanced college degrees while other work may require no formal schooling of any kind.

---


According to Burnett, Collison and Segrist,\textsuperscript{11} in order to respond to educational reform, career education has developed its conceptual efforts around the humanistic forms of "work" whether it is paid or unpaid. Work is defined as conscious effort, aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or others. Utilizing this concept, educators have been able to use their creativity to relate work to their instructional content.

State Career Education Coordinator/Director--the individual employed by a State Department of Education responsible for overall coordination and monitoring of career education related activities (programs, projects, etc.) in a particular state or territory of the United States.

Significance of the Study

Education is undergoing a difficult period in its ability to deliver on professed ideals and goals.\textsuperscript{12} Accountability is being demanded on all educational fronts. In addition, financial cutbacks are occurring in approved


local, state and federal education programs. While new legislation for the support of educational research and development and for vocational and career education has recently been enacted, Congressional allegations regarding the "worth" of educational research and development programs and the report of the Government Accounting Office\(^\text{13}\) on Vocational Education, place full funding of such legislation in jeopardy. These events are important to the future of career education since several facets of present career education programs are dependent upon funding from federal legislation.

The following factors in this study are seen as significant in terms of contributing to the improvement of career education and education in general:

1. The U.S. Office of Education and state departments of education will be provided information useful in decision-making regarding the future development and improvement of career education.

2. State career education coordinators/directors participating in the study should benefit from the information in carrying out their responsibilities.

Study Assumptions

Two assumptions were made at the beginning of this study:

1) Individuals in key leadership positions in the state departments of education have informed perceptions concerning current and projected levels of implementation of career education in their respective states.

2) State coordinators of career education are in key positions to positively contribute to the continued evolution of career education in their respective states. Their collective perceptions concerning the concept is important to local, state and national planning efforts.

Study Limitations

The writer identified several factors which may have limited the completeness of the findings of this study:

1) Not all career education activities underway nationally were identified through this study since some possible cases exist in which the program or project is not administered or coordinated by or through the State
Department of Education (i.e. contracts and grants with independent private corporations).

2) A further limitation exists with regard to the diversity of definitions applied to career education and the programs reported or not reported under this label.

3) The accuracy, availability and uniformity of accounting and reporting procedures with regard to program descriptions and number funded, was also a potential limiting factor.

4) Individual perceptions regarding career education varies with the state coordinators knowledge and experience with the concept. At the time the study was initiated, state coordinators of career education represented an array of educational preparation and experience, as well as considerable difference in the length of tenure in their current positions.

5) Approximately thirty months elapsed between the time the data was collected and the completion of the analysis and writing of this study. Events at national and state levels could have changed the survey responses of the participants in this study.
Study Delimitations

At least two factors limited or fixed the boundaries of this study:

1) Of all the "actors" or educators who play critical roles in the implementation of career education, only the state career education coordinators were included as participants in this survey. While the researcher is confident that the state coordinator of career education should have a broad knowledge of what the status of career education is in their state and the underlying reasons for its current status, she did not assume that this person possessed the informed perspective of knowledge of each of these significant other key actors.

2) The variance in governance structures utilized in state and territories with regard to state administrators of education (particularly career education) was also viewed as a delimitation of this study. Some state education departments have placed career education as a separate section of unit, while others have continued this function as part of the vocational education section/division or as a sub-unit of some other unit in the state department. Additionally, some state departments of education administer K-14 educational levels under one
unit, while other states separate K-12 and 13-14 grade levels into separate units. The variance in governance structure could account for differences in fiscal and management authority on the part of state coordinators of career education.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This review is organized around four main sections. First, literature concerning how career education has responded to a number of educational needs is considered. Secondly, studies regarding the nature and quality of career education are examined. Third, the funding patterns and sources are discussed. The final section deals with the relevance of opinion leader studies.

Career Education - A Response to a Need

The latter half of the decade of the 1960's and the early 1970's found parents and taxpayers more cognizant of the expenditure of public funds for schools and more critical concerning the participation of such institutions responsible for the learning process. According to a Harris Survey\(^1\) of public attitudes toward schools completed in October, 1972.

A definite drop among those declaring "a great deal of confidence in education" has occurred. In 1966, 61 percent of the study respondents indicated positive opinions about education. In 1972, this figure had dropped 31 percent. Also in April of

---

1972, a national sample of adults confirmed the rising level of dissatisfaction with 56 percent stating that they would not support an increasing tax base at the polls if schools continued to demand additional operating money. The failure of significant numbers of school bond levies in 1972-1973 confirm their sincerity.

Gallop and other national polls taken throughout the 1970's continued to reflect the public's concern with the shortcoming of the educational programs offered.

In addition to the economic climate, the social climate also clamored for the change in educational programs promised through career education. According to Coleman, the "experiential learning" that once took place in the home and on the job is almost nonexistent in today's society. In a number of homes, both parents work outside the home, establish friends in connection with employment, and socialize outside the home, thus creating a "sterile" learning environment for the child in the home. Young people are being literally excluded from the labor market due to newly imposed labor laws, desire for higher skilled and educated employees and for full-time versus part-time personnel. Coleman sees this dilemma placing

---

additional expectations on the school to fulfill this expanded role caused by the learning void present in the home and place of employment.

The demand for educational accountability grew out of the concern for the devastating statistics relative to the success of students in schools, unemployment rates, and the need for mobility in the labor market. According to Marland, the nation as a whole is concerned about the continuing high level of unemployment, but it should be alarmed to know that in 1976 half of the unemployed were under the age of 20. This percentage has significantly increased during the five years following 1976. These young people do not know about jobs, and do not have the skills for getting jobs. The necessity for occupational mobility was reinforced by Steven Silha who reported that the time is rapidly approaching when a person will not have a life-time commitment to one occupation as in the past, but perhaps as many as seven different jobs.

---


4 Steven Silha, Christian Science Monitor, Volume 66, (March 18, 1974).
Much of the program development efforts for career education have been responsive to the basic problems facing society and educational systems. According to Sidney High, U.S. Office of Career Education,5

During the past decade, there have been ample indications of student dissatisfaction with the current education programs. Many students have elected to withdraw from the formal school system, and those who have remained have complained, sometimes violently, about the lack of "relevance" of their studies. Dissatisfaction on the part of parents and the public at large has been reflected in increasing voter resistance to expenditures of funds on the public schools.

In general, the social and economic situation in the 1970's called for a reorganized and rejuvenated educational program, one which would take place not only in the schools but also in the economic institutions of society, and one which would provide individuals with information, information-processing behaviors, and decision-making skills enabling them to consider and explore wide-ranging alternatives and make rational choices concerning their educational paths and their personal and career goals. The career education concept espoused by Marland in 1971 encompassed all of these features.

David Smoker6 confirmed the fact that career education is responsive to social and economic needs. He

---


stated that "in spite of the pitfalls, the criticisms and the continuing dialogue about how to define the concept and implement it, the evidence all points to a strong possibility that career education is the major redirection in the entire educational system."

A national study completed by the National School Board Association in 1980 surveyed school board members and superintendents concerning their views on global education. When asked to indicate the one topic they thought most deserving of increased attention in their school district, career education was selected as the top priority. When asked the question, "which of the following areas of the program, in your district, are likely to get greatly increased interest and financial support within the next five years?" career education again appeared as the third ranked priority. Basic skills and competency testing ranked first and second respectively.

Selected Career Education Efforts

Educational leaders, including past Assistant Secretary of Education Marland, Associate Commissioner for Career Education Hoyt and Secretary of Education Bell, have continued to stress the importance of "grass roots" involvement (local schools) in the conceptualization, development and implementation of educational concepts and innovations. While the visibility and dollar flow early in 1971 and 1972 tended to come from federal sources, the local school level involvement, self-sustained and motivated initiatives far surpassed the federal and state efforts. By design, the entire concept of career education was to "build on" program, curriculum, and materials already in existence in the field. New development was to occur only in areas needed to fill knowledge or material gaps and in areas relating to dissemination and implementation. A review of the career education program efforts reflect this mode of operation.

The Center for Occupational Education, pursuant to a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, undertook the identification and description of comprehensive

---

programs of excellence in career education throughout the nation in 1972-1973. Approximately 100 school systems participated in this exemplary program identification. As a result of on-site visitations, 15 programs were selected as exemplary and detailed reports were developed of their operations. Nine career education monographs have been developed as a result of this study: (1) A Manual for the Implementation and Administration of Career Education Programs; (2) Elementary School Curriculum Guide; (3) Middle School Curriculum Guide; (4) High School Curriculum Guide; (5) Post-Secondary Career Education; (6) Career Guidance; (7) Placement and Follow-up in Career Education; (8) Professional Development; and (9) Involving the Community in Career Education. The results of this study indicated that while considerable development and program implementation has taken place at the elementary school level, only limited materials and programs have been designed and implemented at the secondary level. Studies of this nature reveal the actual manner in which career education has been successfully implemented in school districts and serve as guideposts to other districts planning or currently implementing career education.
Collaboration and cooperation with organizations outside the formal education structure was a priority of career education in the late 1970's. During the National Conference for Partnerships in Career Education, August 14-17, 1980, the 203 participants were asked to indicate the primary career education roles to be played by a number of organizations or possible contributions to be made by such organizations (e.g., AFL-CIO, 4-H, Association of Junior Leagues, Boy Scouts of America). The ten areas across organizations which gained the highest consensus and were deemed to require the most immediate attention were: (1) Providing SEAs/LEAs with career education materials that teachers and counselors can use in delivering career education to students; (2) Helping educators acquire basic information useful in overcoming bias and stereotyping; (3) Helping educators learn basic information with respect to the career decision-making process; (4) Helping educators gain basic information

---


10 Mary Kosier, Memorandum to Members dated September 26, 1980, National Vocational Guidance Association.
regarding ways in which persons can make wise use of leisure time—including volunteerism done as unpaid work; (5) Helping educators gain a better understanding and appreciation of the community organization as part of American society; (6) Serving as speakers/resource persons at State and local meetings of various professional education association; (7) Gaining community support at the State/Federal levels for career education; (8) Gaining legislative support at the State/Federal levels for career education; (9) Devising, publishing, and distributing materials for parents containing suggestions of ways in which they may provide effective education for their children; and (10) Participating in the collection and analysis of evaluation data aimed at assessing the worth of career education.

Federal Initiatives

The over 100 million dollar federal investment in career education\(^{11}\) has had a far-reaching influence on the efficacy and implementation of career education.

\(^{11}\)Sidney P. Marland, Career Education: Prospect and Retrospect, Distinguished Lecture Series #3, (Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, March, 1975).
The most visible and comprehensive federal initiatives has been the development of four alternative conceptualizations or ways of facilitating career education. Initiated under the leadership of the U.S. Office of Education in 1971, these four models were transferred to the National Institute of Education in 1972. Specifically, these four models for career education were:

1. The School Based Comprehensive Career Education Model (CCEM) was contracted to the Center for Vocational Education at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. Work was undertaken in six local school districts (Hackensack, New Jersey; Los Angeles, California; Mesa, Arizona; Atlanta, Georgia; Pontiac, Michigan and Denver, Colorado to assist the Center in the development of a K-12 paradigm for career education which consisted of eight key elements and 1500 developmental program goal statements to become the basis for learning activities and program implementation. In addition, fourteen modules to assist with staff development and community involvement and thirty
teacher guides representative of the K-12 educational levels, were developed. Additionally, other Center developed materials were field tested by the American Institute of Research.  

2. The Experienced Based Career Education Model (EBCE) was developed and was tested in four sites: Appalachian Educational Laboratory, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, and Research for Better Schools. As explained by Hagans, EBCE was essentially a community and experience-based program for high school students which provided a comprehensive curriculum largely outside the school walls. Major elements included an emphasis on student involvement in community sites as

---


principle bases for learning experiences; integration of teacher and counselor role and sharing these roles with other adults in the community; individualized instruction based on needs assessment; a basic skills component; a life skills component; a career development component; and a system of accountability.

A learning coordinator and a community resource person helped guide the student's learning along with teachers and counselors. According to Buckman,\textsuperscript{14} there is a blending of cognitive, affective, and interpersonal relationship skills with career development skills and increased involvement of students with adults. Early formative evaluation of EBCE has indicated 1) strong community support from both parents and resource persons and organizations, 2) students are not hurt academically by participation in the program, and 3) significant improvement in student attitudes toward the school environment.

3. The Home-Based Career Education Model, conducted by the Educational Development Center in Providence, Rhode Island, was directed toward adults who were not employed or in school. The model was designed to inform individuals (most of whom were women) about the work and training opportunities in the community and to use mass communication media to reach and assess the career interests of certain home-based populations. The developer has established an extensive bibliography and set of materials on such topics as establishing career resource centers, training career counselors, women and work, labor market and trends data, evaluating programs, and the like.\footnote{Lois Ellen Datta and Corrine H. Rieder, "Career Education in the National Institute of Education." \textit{New Generation}, Volume 55, Number 1, (Winter, 1973), pages 5-13.}

4. The Residential Career Education Model was under development in Montana by the
Mountain Plains Education and Economic Development Program, Inc. Focus of the rural-residential project was on multi­problem and chronically underemployed rural families. The project attempted to deal with the total family and to influence all significant aspects of the family. The major goal was to use career counseling and guidance, training, remedial education and family development and homemaking skills to make the family economically viable. 16

The U.S. Office of Education was responsible for providing the initial leadership for career education nationally, including the initiation of many of the programs and projects presently under the auspices of the National Institute of Education. 17 In 1972, USOE sponsored at The Center for Vocational Education two national seminars


on career education for the deans of colleges of education and professors of educational administration. The University of Maryland was funded that same year to conduct a series of 16 regional conferences on career education to begin to define and promote the concept.

One career education project conducted by personnel at The Center for Vocational Education under Part C of the Educational Amendments of 1968, was designed to prepare career education materials for college and university level undergraduate education programs. University teams were identified nationally who assisted Center personnel with this curriculum guideline development effort.\textsuperscript{18}

With the creation of the position of Associate Commissioner for Career Education and an Office of Career Education in the U.S. Office of Education under the Educational Amendments of 1974, several initiatives for expansion of the concept began. Beginning in early 1974, a series of mini-conferences for career education practitioners were conducted\textsuperscript{19} by Associate Commissioner Hoyt and staff to further explore and define the parameters of the career education concept. In October, 1974, the First

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid.

National Conference for State Coordinators of Career Education was conducted at the Center for Vocational Education. It was at this conference that the U.S. Office of Education presented its official policy paper on career education which included a definition of the concept.

The federal role in the evolution of the career education concept has obviously been extensive and provided the intended stimulant to "grass roots" (local schools) agencies. The goal of widespread participation in defining and developing the career education concept would appear to have been met. Former U.S. Commissioner of Education Ottina's comment concerning the strategy used to develop and diffuse career education is confirmed by the evidence provided in this section. He stated:

In the first years of federal leadership in career education, a dual strategy developed that encouraged spontaneous innovation and, simultaneously, systematic efforts to test the emerging career education concept. At the state and local levels a large number of school districts responded to early initiatives by applying federal funds in imaginative ways to bring career education into actual school practice.  

---


In 1976 Bonnet synthesized and summarized the evaluation results of 45 of 108 K-12 career education demonstration projects that had been funded by the U. S. Office of Education during the 1975-76 academic year. In developing a unit analysis for the study, Bonnet developed "learner outcomes" for each grade level (over 500 total) based on each of the 10 goals for career education established by the U.S. Office of Education. Due to the non-uniform nature of the evaluation data reported in the 45 studies, the researcher was not able to conclude that a given career education implementation strategy produced any given reported result at any specified level or length of application. Bonnet could only conclude that the career education implementation strategy was used at particular grade levels. Regardless of limitations identified relating to the data and methodology she employed, Bonnet's findings were very favorable.

---


concerning the effectiveness of career education. The analysis produced statistically significant positive results for learner outcomes associated with eight of the ten U.S. Office of Career Education goals. In general, the study results report evidence of career education's ability to positively affect (1) increases in students' desire to work, (2) increases in students acquisition of career decision-making skills, and (3) students' awareness of the nature of occupations. Even under the severe limitations of the study, these results appear to be adequately demonstrated.

**State Initiatives**

State departments of education, colleges and universities have made a considerable impact in the development of career education programs. According to the National Advisory Council on Career Education: 24

> There has been considerable interest in the development of career education legislation at the state level. State legislation relating to career education exists in fourteen of the states at the present time. Legislation is either pending or in some state of discussion in seven additional states. The number of states actually possessing legislation for career education represents 28 percent of the fifty states or slightly more than one-fourth.

---

(When a total of 57 jurisdictions is used as base, the percentage drops to 24, or slightly less than one-fourth).

Dr. Sidney High has reported that with funds from the state legislature, Arizona established pilot projects in career education in every county of the state. These state supported pilot projects were in addition to large federally funded pilot projects in Mesa and Tucson. The entire effort was planned and coordinated by a state level task force. The State Department of Education operates a career education clearinghouse which collects, assesses, categorizes, and distributes career education curriculum materials to local school districts throughout the state. A public information program is operated through newspapers, radio, television, and other media, to inform business and industrial people, workers, and parents about career education and to keep them abreast of the progress of career education activities.

It is also important to look at colleges and universities with regard to career education. According

---

to a 1975 AIR National Survey, less than 10 percent of responding institutions of higher education were found to be conducting programs or activities that could be identified with career education.

The University of Georgia, Indiana University, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota and The Ohio State University were among the few institutions which have ongoing preservice teacher education projects relating to career education. Michigan State University has made notable strides toward implementing a pre and in-service element of career education within the College of Education. According to Heilman,

Career Education as an area of emphasis within the College of Education had its roots in a spontaneous, informal concern on the part of a small number of faculty. This concern was

---


reflected in the appointment of an Ad Hoc Committee by Dean Goldhammer in the Fall of 1972 to make a feasibility study and provide recommendations regarding the posture of the College of Education regarding career education as a major thrust and should initially organize itself in the following manner:

(a) Appoint a college coordinator for career education; and (b) Appoint a career education council with the responsibility of identifying areas of involvement, planning programs and formulating recommendations to the Dean of the College.

The Council's responsibility was identified more precisely in a memorandum to the faculty from Dean Goldhammer which was published in the College of Education's Newsletter dated January 23, 1974.

"The Council on Career Education will serve as the major policy advisory body for the College in career education."

In the same memorandum a coordinator for career education was appointed to become effective Spring Term, 1974.

Following the Council's appointment and extension to 1973, two recommendations were developed and approved:

1. That the College of Education adopt the following operational definition for career education:

   Career education is a pervasive element of the life long educational process which emphasizes the interrelationships of occupational roles with civic, family and avocational roles.

2. That three task forces be appointed by the Dean:

   Elementary, middle school, and senior high and postsecondary.
These three task forces were to become familiar with career education and make further recommendations regarding the College's role.

Michigan Public Act 97 also provided direction for teacher training institutions regarding career education.

From another viewpoint,29 Miguel indicated that state departments of education were "lagging" in their implementation of career education. Coordinators from forty-five state departments of education met with Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director of the Office of Career Education, USOE, at several mini-conferences in order to discuss the status, problems, concerns and successes of coordination of career education within the states. There seemed to be a consensus that there is a strong interest and enthusiasm in career education at the local educational level. However, there did not appear to be as high of interest or support of career education at the state department of education level. This factor is of direct interest in this study given the fiscal control of state level decision-makers and their perceived influence on local program priorities and development.

Local Initiatives

Several educational leaders have been quoted as expressing the fact that no educational movement or concept has gained the level of support and initiative at the "grass roots" (local level) as career education. Former USOE Commissioner Bell has stated: \(^{30}\)

Career education continues to find its greatest strength and most dramatic growth at the local level. The Council of Chief State School Officers estimates that almost 5,000 of the 17,000 school districts in the United States had active career education programs in 1974. Those who, in the past, have contended that it takes 50 years for any good idea to become common practice in American Education are being proved wrong by Career Education. This remarkable local support for career education is its most impressive credential. It speaks loud and clear both for the viability of the career education concept and of the need for career education.

Several studies have been conducted on various kinds of career education efforts. As previously stated, Morgan and Dane \(^{31}\) also conducted a study of 15 comprehensive programs of career education in 1972-1973.


Smoker\textsuperscript{32} surveyed local career education efforts as to specific variables in 1974 and described the more advanced and innovative efforts in a research report. In 1975, a survey conducted by the American Institute for Research (AIR)\textsuperscript{33} reported that 60 percent of the school systems in America were making at least limited efforts toward establishing career education. Fifty-seven percent of the school districts surveyed were providing staff development inservice for some faculty members in career education. Twenty percent of the teachers in American schools were taking inservice training in career education. Only 3 percent of the school districts surveyed were found to be meeting all of the survey criteria for a comprehensive career education program.


The American Institute for Research (AIR), under contract with the U.S. Office of Career Education, in 1979-81 began a study with the intent of utilizing a new evaluation approach that would take into account the severe limitations of conventional program impact evaluations. In launching the evaluation effort they identified four requirements: (1) intended program objectives and activities be clearly specified and accepted by both policy-makers and program managers; (2) casual assumptions underlying the program be explicitly stated; (3) acceptable performance indicators be identified; (4) intended uses of the evaluation's results be agreed upon by the potential users. In the first two phases of this study a number of preliminary models were prepared. Results provided AIR with the basis to proceed with the evaluation.

According to Hoyt\textsuperscript{35} career education during its first decade of existence has been subjected to an extensive array of evaluation efforts. If one were to assess the outcomes of these efforts completed to date, Hoyt states that the results are more positive than negative. As a result Hoyt hypothesizes that, "there is more reason to believe that career education is effective than there is to believe it is lacking in effectiveness."\textsuperscript{36} Hoyt further believes that there are problems confronting career education, but that many of these problems are due to the fact that the concept is still evolving.

The Financing of Career Education

Both the nature and the level of funding for career education have diversified and increased dramatically since U.S. Commissioner of Education Marland's address in Houston in 1971.\textsuperscript{37}.


\textsuperscript{36}Ibid, page 45.

Initially, the Commissioner of Education found himself in the dilemma of having revitalized interest in an educational concept which promised to deliver on the educational needs of society, and no readily available funds with which to provide initiative.

In the absence of funds specifically earmarked for career education, the Office of Education drew upon the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968,³⁸ Parts C and D, dealing with research and development in vocational education and exemplary programs and projects, to fund the initial effort. As stated earlier by July 1, 1971 four prime contractors had been engaged to develop four alternative models for career education with these funds. In addition, two exemplary programs in school districts in each of the fifty states were financed. Additional federal initiative for career education was provided through the use of these funds throughout the balance of 1971 and 1972.

By 1972, the "promise" of career education as a means of school systems for delivering on the public's ideals for education, began to have an extensive impact.

The State of Arizona became the first to pass into law\textsuperscript{39} legislation which called for career education to be implemented throughout the state's educational system. As previously noted, this was only the first in a series of such important moves on the part of state legislatures for career education. Miguel\textsuperscript{40} has reported that the 'line item' approach in the state budget appears to be one idea that is working in many states. These phenomena have both increased the number of school districts who have integrated career education into their educational process, as well as stimulated local school districts to invest local level dollars in the evolvement and implementation of the concept. Thus, the intent of federal legislation to stimulate positive change in education which will eventually be expanded and improved by state and local educational systems, would appear to have been satisfied in the case of career education.

\textsuperscript{39}State of Arizona, Senate Bill 5, 30th Legislature, First Session, July 1, 1971.

\textsuperscript{40}Richard J. Miguel, Career Education Mini-Conferences Final Report, (Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational Education, July, 1976). page 144.
The extent to which state and local funds historically and at present are being invested in career education and the nature of such funding, are elements of data not readily available. The fact that considerable proportions of state vocational education funds have been invested in the area of career education, further complicates the problem of accounting for dollars spent for career education at various levels.

The establishment of the National Institute of Education in the Educational Amendments of 1972 brought about a change in the federal level of expectation for career education.\textsuperscript{41} The four USOE career education models referred to earlier in this chapter, as well as several other career education related research and development projects and programs, became the responsibility of the Institute and thus were incorporated into the funding provisions of the Act.

The first actual Congressional mandate for career education evolved as a result of the enactment of Section 406, Title IV, P. L. 93-380, or better known as the Educational Amendments of 1974.\textsuperscript{42}


The following excerpt from the Act provides the intent of this legislation:

It is the sense of Congress that -

(1) every child should, by the time he has completed secondary school, be prepared for gainful or maximum employment and for full participation in our society according to his or her ability;

(2) it is the obligation of each local educational agency to provide that preparation for all children (including handicapped children and all other children who are educationally disadvantaged) within the school district of such agency; and

(3) each State and local educational agency should carry out a program of career education which provides every child the widest variety of career education options which are designed to prepare each child for maximum employment and participation in our society according to his or her ability.

During the period beginning with the enactment of this section and ending June 30, 1978, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to State and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other nonprofit agencies and organizations to support projects to demonstrate the most effective methods and techniques in career education and to develop exemplary career education models (including models in which handicapped children receive appropriate career education either by participation in regular or modified programs with nonhandicapped children or where necessary in specially designed programs for handicapped children whose handicaps are of such severity that they cannot benefit from regular or modified programs).

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to expend but not to exceed $15,000,000 for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1978.
The level actually appropriated was $10,000,000.

In answer to a question regarding research and development funding for career education, Dr. Sidney P. Marland, then President of the College Entrance Examination Board, made this reply:

Since 1971, federal funds alone, from O.E. and N.I.E. have exceeded $100 million, over and above the very substantial developmental funds invested by states and local systems, publishers, associations and individuals. School systems and colleges are moving ahead with what research and development evidence they have, and in doing so are contributing to the body of knowledge on the subject by trial and error.

In addition to providing continual and renewed emphasis on vocational education and career development, the Education Amendments of 1976 also addressed career education. Under Section 331-335, a total of $10 million was authorized for the fiscal year 1978 for career education. The specific purpose of this federal assistance to states is to enable them to plan for the development of career education and career development programs and

---

43Sidney P. Marland, Career Education: Prospect and Retrospect, Distinguished Lecture Series #3, (Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, March, 1975).

44Vocational Education Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, pages 2221-2222.
activities for individuals of all ages. Specifically, the provision is to provide for accomplishing the following functions:

(1) planning for the development of information on the needs for career development for all individuals;

(2) planning for the promotion of a national dialogue on career education and career development designed to encourage each State and local educational agency to determine and adopt the approach best suited to the needs of the individuals served by each such agency;

(3) planning for the assessment of the status of career education and career development programs and practices, including a reassessment of the stereotyping of career opportunities by race or by sex;

(4) planning for the demonstration of the best of the current career education and career development programs and practices by planning to develop and test exemplary programs and practices using various theories, concepts, and approaches with respect to career education and through planning for a nationwide system of regional career education centers;

(5) planning for the training and retraining of persons for conducting career education and career development programs;

(6) developing state and local plans for implementing programs designed to ensure that every person has the opportunity to gain the knowledge and skills necessary for gainful or maximum employment and for full participation in our society according to his or her ability.
The Career Education Incentive Act of 1977, constitutes a significant mechanism for future growth and expansion of the concept. The President on December 13, 1977, approved a $325 million five-year career education program for elementary and secondary schools and colleges, with the majority of each year's appropriation for elementary/secondary scheduled to pass through the states to local education agencies in the form of grants. The remaining funds were to be utilized to maintain the U.S. Office of Career Education and key national functions such as research, information systems, evaluation, etc.

The Act authorized $50 million for elementary and secondary programs in fiscal 1979, $100 million in 1980, another $100 million in 1981, $50 million in 1982 and $25 million in 1983. After the first year, the program must be advanced funded, meaning in fiscal 1979 Congress had to appropriate for two years, 1979 and 1980. The rationale was that individual states should assume increased responsibility for career education program maintenance and evolution as Federal incentive funds

---

decreased. Funds not allocated to states by established formula were to be utilized as follows: an amount not to exceed 5 percent each year for Federal administration and funding model program grants, one percent for an information program, and one-half of one percent for national evaluations. One percent goes to the territories—Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa and the Pacific Trust, with the remainder (approximately 90 percent) allocated to the states, including Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, on a count of children ages 5 to 18. No state will get less than $125,000, unless the appropriation is not enough to cover that minimum, in which case the figure will be notably reduced.

Postsecondary demonstration projects administered by the U.S. Office of Education received a separate authorization of $15 million during each of the five years.

Under the law, states had to continue to spend at least as much for career education as they spent in the preceding fiscal year and were supposed to pay from non-Federal funds the non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out a state plan.

The state education agency needed to insure that (1) career education programs were part of the regular instructional program of the local education agency, not just a part of vocational education; (2) programs
were administered by a state coordinator with previous experience in the career education field; and (3) state agency staff included at least one person experienced in problems of discrimination and stereotyping in career education including at least one other professional trained in guidance and counseling.

States were able to meet the staffing requirements by hiring people part-time or utilizing already employed staff part-time. In addition, those states that receive the minimum allocation of $125,000 were not required to meet the staffing standards.

Ten percent of the state's allocation each year may be used for state leadership activities, with 10 percent in 1979 and 5 percent each year thereafter will be allowed for employing extra staff and administering the state plan. Federal money paid all of the cost of staff in 1979, but only 75 percent in 1980 and one-half thereafter. State leadership activities and grants to local education agencies could be 100 percent federally funded in 1979 and 1980, but after that the state has to pick up 25 percent of the expenditures in 1981 and 50 percent in 1982, with at least 75 percent of the funding coming from the state by the time the program goes into its final years in 1983.

The state is required to use not less than 15 percent of its local grant funds for local education
agency programs in guidance and counseling, but the
House-Senate conference members determined that the 15
percent minimum expenditure for guidance and counseling
does not have to be followed by each individual school
district.

The state education agency is charged with making
grants to local education agencies on a "equitable"
basis, taking into account special needs of local
education agencies in areas where there is high unemploy­
ment or where population is sparse. States were
specifically forbidden to distribute funds to local
education agencies on the basis of per capita enrollment
or by matching expenditures on a uniform percentage basis.
Also, the states were not allowed to deny funds to a
local education agency which was unable to pay the non-
Federal share of the cost of a program providing that the
school district was making a "reasonable" tax effort.

A local school district could use the money to:
(1) install career education concepts in the classroom,
(2) carry out career education guidance, counseling,
placement and follow-up, (3) develop collaboration with
handicapped, minority and women's groups and use people
from those organizations in the classroom and on field
trips, (4) set up work experiences for students who want
to explore specific careers, provided there is a chance of jobs in the field and that the students do not displace other workers, (5) hire or train coordinators to pull together career education programs in the local education agency or several school districts (but not just in one school building), (6) give inservice training, (7) conduct institutes for board members and parents, (8) buy materials and supplies, (9) operate community career education councils or resource centers, and (10) conduct needs assessments and program evaluations.

This Act is administered by U.S. Office of Education's Office of Career Education, which was created by law in 1974, including the National Advisory Council on Career Education that was created at the same time.

The level of appropriations for the first three years of the authorization provided for in Public Law 95-207 have not met expectations. In fact, FY 1979 and 1980 appropriations amounted to $20 million or only 40 percent of authorized expenditure level for FY 1979 and 20 percent for FY 1980.46 The FY 1980 appropriations

level of $20 million was further reduced to $15 million as a part of an overall rescission in funding for educational programs. Due to a late appropriation cycle and the significant shift in political power in the Congress, a FY 1981 appropriations bill did not reach completion. Instead, Congress passed a continuing resolutions bill for FY 1981 appropriations resulting in $15 million dollar appropriation level for career education, in FY 1981.

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Act of 1977 provided opportunity for funding of career education. This law for the first time gave CETA a significant role with regard to in-school populations. Specific funding was called for to support counseling, activities promoting education to work transitions, and development of information concerning the labor market,

---


and provision of occupational, educational, and training information.\textsuperscript{49} In a FY 1982 administration budget released January 15, 1981, career education was recommended for zero funding.\textsuperscript{50} These reduced appropriations levels significantly reduce the intent of the law which calls for full implementation of career education K-12 level by FY 1983.\textsuperscript{51}

Relevance of Leadership Studies

State educational agencies and their respective administrative staffs continue to perform key roles in the planning, management, evolution or redirection of educational programs at the local level. Their influence on local programs is primarily due to their fiscal and regulatory responsibilities regarding federal and state


resources which are administered through state agencies. Performance of administrative roles and fulfillment of basic leadership functions have given state education staff the status of respected expert consultants concerning the current state of and future of educational programs. State coordinators of career education are among these expert consultants. Since the beginning of the career education movement in 1971, state coordinators of career education have fulfilled their leadership role as it relates to the evolving career education concept and served as expert consultants for such agencies and groups as American Institute for Research, U.S. Office of Education, New Educational Directions, Inc., Institute for Educational Development, National Center for Research in Vocational Education and numerous masters and doctoral students to name a few.

In addition to studies reported earlier in this chapter, state coordinators of career education were asked to serve as expert consultants in 1977 as part of a study conducted to further define the role of the state coordinator of career education.  

Leadership studies are typically conducted utilizing survey research methodology. This particular method of data acquisition is utilized in such fields as education, industry, politics and business. It provides a rapid and cost-effective means of acquiring key information needed for decision-making from a widely geographical dispersed population.

Geographical distribution of state coordinators of education in all states and territories compelled this researcher to consider the most cost effective method of collecting accurate and timely data.

Summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter has a number of implications for the study being undertaken. The following statements were arrived at as a result of synthesis of the literature and relate to the study's objectives:

1. Career education nationally is unevenly developed at state and local levels influenced in part by differing levels of state and local leadership and levels of funding.

---

2. Inadequate definition and conceptual clarity concerning career education appear to be impeding its acceptance and implementation at all educational levels.

3. The level of administrative support and lack of uniformity of organizational structure for career education at the state level, has had a negative impact on the development of career education programs in local school systems in specific states.

4. Competition for limited state and local funding for education has caused national objectives to fall short of their projected outcome.

5. At the federal level, fiscal appropriations have not met authorized funding levels since the establishment of the Career Education Incentive Act of 1977.

6. In the absence of local, state and national impact data on the status of career education, program and funding decisions regarding career education are based on widely dispersed or non-existent criteria.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

The study was conducted according to the methodology employed in survey research. Survey research is the most frequently used research in studies relating to education.\(^1\) This chapter provides the details of the procedure employed including: (1) design, (2) population and sample, (3) instrumentation and data collection, (4) study limitations and delimitations, and (5) analysis of data.

Study Design

The study employed a survey research design. Data were collected from a census of the population of state coordinators of career education. Since the study was national in scope, it surveyed positions in all 50 states, six (6) territories and the District of Columbia. Operational definitions were developed for career education and state coordinators of career education for use in this study which may be found in Chapter I. Study variables

were identified and specific objectives developed which provided the framework for collecting data relative to this study's purpose. Specific details relative to the design of the study are addressed in the remaining sections of this chapter.

Population

State coordinators of career education comprised the population to be studied. This particular population was selected for this study due to their leadership role in administering and managing fiscal and material resources at the state level for maximum impact at the local level. A 1979 roster of State career education coordinators is found in Appendix A. Due to the nature of the study and the size of the population, a total population of state coordinators of career education was used. While the occupational titles of these individuals vary, they are all charged with the primary function of coordinating and supervising career education programs. An updated roster of State Coordinators of Career Education was obtained from the Office of Career Education immediately preceding the mailing of the survey instrument. The survey was responded to by 54 of the 57 potential study participants (50 states, 6 territories and District of Columbia).
Two territories indicated that they did not wish to respond to the mail questionnaire. One territory did not respond to either mail or telephone followup efforts.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

The survey instrument used to collect data relevant to the specific objectives of the study, was based on data requested by a number of state and federal career education leaders during the First National Conference of State Coordinators of Career Education, Columbus, Ohio, October 31 - November 4, 1974. The following questions were informally raised regarding the current status of career education nationally:

2. To whom do you report in the state department of education?

- In what academic discipline was your formal education?

- On what date was your position created and when did you assume it?

---

- Is your position full time or part time?
- How is your position funded?
- What is the status of career education legislation in your state?
- What is the approximate amount of state appropriated education funds currently being expended for career education in your state?

From this list of questions, a number of additional questions and sub questions were developed and incorporated into a survey questionnaire which related to the four study objectives addressing the descriptive nature of the career education program. A demographic program section was designed to collect key status information regarding specific state programs. Section II of the instrument was comprised of 10 goals for career education as identified by the U.S. Office of Education. The data collected in this section were in direct response to the study objective relating to determining the extent to which career education is being conceptualized and implemented in accordance with federal goals. A Likert type scale was used to solicit responses from study participants related to these 10 goals.

---

The questionnaire was structured as much as possible to allow for ease of response. A panel of experts in the area of career education was selected to pilot the instrument. This included a review by the Ohio State Department Coordinator of Career Education, two prominent career education researchers, and a former career education state staff member.

Data were collected by means of a mailed questionnaire (see Appendix B). A cover letter was prepared which explained the purpose of the study and directions pertaining to the completion of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). A followup mailed questionnaire was sent to nonrespondents after two weeks of the initial mailing. Telephone calls were placed to all state coordinators not responding to the followup mailed questionnaire.

Analysis of Data

The nature of the data collected primarily required compilation of facts. Some data were of a nature which required percentages to be calculated and some measures of association to be analyzed. The analysis primarily consisted of comparisons of total numbers and percentages relating to various career education status data. In addition, the various demographic status and basic goals for career education variables were compared using
Cramer's $V^4$, Phi Coefficient and Kendall's Tau B and Tau C$^5$ as appropriate. Characteristics of the data made it necessary to utilize a variety of measures of association. For example, the data varied from nominal to ordinal in nature and the contingency tables were both square and rectangular. Cramer's V and Phi Coefficient were utilized as appropriate for tables containing nominal data. Kendall's Tau B and Tau C were utilized for contingency tables which were comprised of ordinal level data.

---


5Ibid, pages 792-801.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This chapter provides the specific data analysis and findings of the study. The first section of Chapter IV provides the status of career education programs in each state in 1979 and basic demographic information concerning organizational structure at the state level as specified in study objectives 1-4. The analysis is based on data from career education coordinators of fifty (50) states, District of Columbia and three United States territories, including American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico. Section II reports the extent to which state coordinators of career education accepted and have implemented the ten (10) basic goals for career education established by the U.S. Office of Career Education in 1976 as specified in study objection 5.

The U.S. Office of Career Education funded the American Institute of Research (AIR) to complete a national survey of career education programs in the public

---

schools for school year 1974-1975. Where appropriate, references and comparative findings are noted in the narrative of this study relating to appropriate data tables.

Section I: Status of Career Education Programs

The data collected from coordinators of career education responding to the mail questionnaire are reported in this section. In general, the data in this section reveal that several states/territories and the District of Columbia underwent a recent transition in state leadership in terms of personnel, organization structure, and/or support bases and administration of career education programs.

Four specific objectives were established concerning program status and relevant data bases collected and analyzed for each. These include:

Objective 1: The extent to which formal mechanisms have been established in states which promote the development and implementation of career education.

---

Data Categories

1. Titles of state departments of education staff responsible for career education (Table 1).

2. State department staffing for career education (Table 2).

3. Area of academic preparation of state coordinator of career education (Table 3).

4. Reporting channel for career education within state department of education (Table 4).

5. Status of formal state commitment to career education (Table 5).

6. Anticipated result of withdrawal or significant reduction of federal support for career education (Table 6).

7. State advisory councils on career education (Table 7).

Objective 2: The approximate total dollars invested in career education by individual states for the 1977-1978 school year.

Data Category

1. 1977-1978 level of state fiscal support for career education (Table 8).

Objective 3: The extent to which school districts have implemented career education.

Data Categories

1. Implementation of career education in local school districts (Table 9).

2. Number of local K-12 school districts per state/territory in 1977-1978 (Table 10).
3. Percent of local school districts with designated career education coordinator/director positions in 1977-1978 (Table 11).

4. Number of states with local school district career education coordinator/director positions (Table 12).

5. 1977-1978 level of state fiscal support for career education (Table 8).

6. Relationship of the existence of a designated local school career education administrator and the extent to which the school district has implemented career education in grades K through 6 (Table 17).

7. Relationship of the existence of a designated local school career education administrator and the extent to which the school district has implemented career education in grades 7 through 9 (Table 18).

8. Relationship of the existence of a designated local school career education administrator and the extent to which the school district has implemented career education in grades 10 through 12 (Table 19).

Objective 4: The major constraints/successes experienced by local and state coordinators of career education in the implementation of career education programs.

Data Categories

1. Major constraints to full implementation of career education (Table 13).

2. Success of implementing career education related program elements (Table 14).

In addition, the data collected in response to each of the four demographic objectives were cross-tabulated and analyzed to provide further insight regarding the status of career education nationally.
Titles of State Career Education Leaders

Approximately 25 of the respondents or 49 percent indicated that the staff member responsible for the career education program at the state department level has the title of state career education coordinator as presented in Table 1, while 13 or 25.7 percent are titled career education specialists. The remaining 13 study respondents or 24.7 percent possessed an array of titles as shown in Table 1.

Levels of State Department Staffing

Twenty-eight of the study respondents or 54.9 percent of the study participants responding indicated that their position(s) were full-time staff positions. (See Table 2). Three study participants did not respond to this survey item. This staffing allocation data reflect no progress was made regarding full-time state level positions since 1974-75 when the AIR study also found only 28 states reporting specified full time positions for career education. This may be an indicator of why career education has not had a more significant impact during the five year period 1974-1979, and why particular states have excelled others in both funding and program implementation.

^Ibid, page 118.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Career Education Coordinator</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Education Specialist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Vocational Education Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Pupil Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Special Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Division of General Support Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
STATE DEPARTMENT STAFFING FOR CAREER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Staff</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time staff</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time staff</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Preparation

A review of data in Table 3 reveals the main area of academic preparation of the state coordinators for career education is in the area of counseling and guidance with 30 of the study respondents or 55.5 percent indicating that area. Twelve of the study respondents or 22.2 percent indicated that their preparation was in education administration. The remainder of the study respondents area of preparation was a distributed array: vocational education 14.8 percent, secondary education 5.6 percent and post-secondary education 1.9 percent. In 1974-75, the AIR study reported that state career education coordinators backgrounds included 15 counselors, 15 non-vocational teachers, 10 vocational teachers, 9 school administrators,
and 7 with experience in business, labor or industry.\textsuperscript{4}

The significant increase in the percentage of counseling and guidance personnel in state level career education roles, could influence the career education program content in the direction of occupational information and career planning rather than the broader definition.

\textbf{TABLE 3}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
Area of Academic Preparation & Frequency of Response & Percentage of Response \\
\hline
Counseling and Guidance & 30 & 55.5 \\
Educational Administration & 12 & 22.2 \\
Vocational Education & 8 & 14.8 \\
Secondary Education & 3 & 5.6 \\
Postsecondary Education & 1 & 1.9 \\
Total & 54 & 100.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid, page 118.
Reporting Channels

Table 4 depicts that 24 of the state career education coordinators or 46.2 percent report to the states' Assistant Superintendent for Program. In eight states or 15.4 percent, the reporting channel is directly to the Director of Vocational Education, while 11.5 percent of the state career education coordinators report to the Director of Guidance and Counseling. Only 2 of the state career education coordinators or 3.8 percent report directly to the Chief State School Officer and 2 or 3.8 percent were found to report directly to the Deputy Chief State School Officer. Eight of the study respondents or 15.4 percent selected "other" as a response to the question.

The "other" responses were:

1. Bureau Chief, Bureau of Community and Adult Education
2. Associate Superintendent Area Schools and Career Education Branch
3. Director of Elementary and Secondary Education
4. Chief Supervisor of Ancillary Services-Vocational Education
5. Directory of Elementary and Secondary Education
6. Director, Division of Federal Support Services
7. Dean, Guam Community College
8. Assistant Secretaria of Education

Two study respondents did not respond to this survey item.
### TABLE 4

REPORTING CHANNEL FOR CAREER EDUCATION WITHIN STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Channel for Career Education Coordinator/Director within State Department</th>
<th>Number of States</th>
<th>Percentage of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Program</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Vocational Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief State School Officer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formal State Commitment

The existence of formal position statements by state legislatures concerning career education were not found to exist in the majority of states. Table 5 reports that 18 of the states or 35.3 percent had state legislation authorizing career education while 33 of the states did not or 64.7 percent. Ten of the states or 19.6 percent were reported as having state legislative position statements endorsing career education programs while 41 of the states or 80.4 percent responded to this survey item negatively. Thirty six of the states or 69.2 percent do have state board position statements supporting career education programs while 16 of the states or 30.8 percent did not. Two study participants did not respond to the survey item referring to state legislation while three study participants failed to respond to the survey item relating to state board actions. Forty seven of the states and territories or 88.7 percent reported that state plans for career education had been developed. Since a formal state plan is a prerequisite for federal career or education funding consideration, it is assumed that the states and territories responding in the negative have since completed a formal state plan or chose not to receive federal support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal State Commitment To Career Education</th>
<th>State Legislation</th>
<th>State Legislation Position Statement</th>
<th>State Board Position Statement</th>
<th>State Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The AIR study of school year 1974-1975\(^5\) revealed that formal written policies were in existence in 42 states and specific legislation for career education existed in 9 states. The fact that the number of states with specific career education legislation had doubled in a period of four years is a positive indication of career education's impact at the state level during this period. It is anticipated that this increased level of public support for career education at the state level will provide leverage for increased appropriations for career education program implementation within the respective states. The increased attention to career education given by state legislative bodies should also positively impact on the Congress' annual consideration of the federal budget for career education.

**Effects of Reduced Federal Support**

An overwhelming majority of the study participants indicated that career education program efforts would be significantly reduced if federal support for career education were significantly withdrawn or reduced. Table 6 indicates that 36 of the states or 76.6 percent anticipated this outcome. This parallels the finding in Table 13 wherein the major constraint to full implementation of

\[^{5}\text{Ibid, page 118.}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Result of Withdrawal of Federal Support</th>
<th>Frequency of Response No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Would Assume the Additional Fiscal Burden to Maintain Local and State Initiatives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Systems Would Assume the Additional Fiscal Burden to Maintain Local Initiatives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Education Program Efforts Would be Significantly Reduced</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
career education was identified as reduction of fiscal resources. Six of the states of 12.8 percent anticipate that local school systems would assume the additional fiscal burden to maintain local initiatives, while 5 of the states or 10.6 percent indicated the state would assume the additional fiscal burden to maintain local state initiatives. Seven study participants did not respond to this survey item.

State Advisory Councils

Table 7 reveals that 42 of the states or 79.2 percent have established a career education advisory council, while 11 of the states or 20.8 percent have not established such a council. One study participant did not respond to this item. The AIR study\(^6\) indicates that in 1974-1975 only 18 states had established formal advisory committees. The four year period between these two studies thus accounted for an increase in the establishment of state advisory councils by 24 or an increase of 133 percent.

In the terms of the utilization of advisory councils, 21 states or 47.7 percent indicated they made moderate use of the state career education council in planning and

\(^6\)Ibid, page 118.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established a Career Education Advisory Council</th>
<th>Utilization of Council in Planning and Program Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
program direction. Seventeen or 38.7 percent utilized the council extensively while Table 7 shows 6 states or 13.6 percent utilized the state council on career education to a limited degree. Ten study participants did not respond to this survey item.

Current Level of State Fiscal Support

State fiscal support for career education varied extensively in 1977-1978 as shown in Table 8. Six of the states reporting or 11.8 percent funded career education in excess of $1 million, and 41 states or more than 80 percent provided less than $500 thousand in support. Three study participants did not respond to this survey item. The level of local fiscal support for career education was excluded from the data reported in Table 8.

For the 1974-75 school year, the AIR study\(^7\) reported that while more than $50,000 were spent for career education in half the states, specific funding for career education could only be found in the budgets in 12 states. The study further reports that a nebulous distinction exists between career education funds and vocational education.

\(^7\)Ibid, page 117-118.
TABLE 8
1977-1978 LEVEL OF STATE FISCAL SUPPORT
FOR CAREER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Funding Levels</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101,000 - 200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$201,000 - 300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$301,000 - 400,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$401,000 - 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$501,000 - 1,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $1,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
funds. This was also cited as a problem by some of the participants in this study. In one instance it was noted that all state vocational education program improvement funds from subpart 3, section 131-133 of Public Law 94-482, are being utilized for career education.

**Implementation in Local School Districts**

The extent to which career education curriculum and concepts have been exposed to students in local school programs at various levels is reported in Table 9. For grades kindergarten through grade six, 26 states or 50 percent reported implementation at a level of 25 percent or less, 11 states 21.2 percent at 26-50 percent, 10 states 19.2 percent at 51-75 percent, and 5 states 9.6 percent at the 76-100 percent level. For grades seven through nine, 27 states or 54 percent reported implementation at a level of 25 percent or less, 13 states 26 percent at 26-50 percent, 8 states 16 percent at 51-75 percent and 2 states indicated 4 percent at the 76-100 percent level. For grades ten through twelve, 35 states or 70 percent reported implementation at a level of 25 percent or less, 7 states 14 percent at 26-50 percent, 6 states 12 percent at 51-75 percent, and 2 states or 4 percent at the 100 percent level. Of the grade levels reported, the ten through twelve grade level had the highest frequency of response in the 25 percent or less
## TABLE 9

IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION IN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR 1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Percentage of School Districts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
category of implementation. It is interesting to note that states with full-time coordinators for career education reported a higher level of implementation for all grade levels in comparison to states who employ state coordinators on a part-time basis.

**Number of School Districts in States/Territories**

Table 10 indicates that 12 states or 22.6 percent have between one and fifty school districts consisting of kindergarten through twelfth grades. Seven states or 13.3 percent have 51 to 100 school districts, while 6 states or 11.3 percent have 151 to 200 school districts. Five states or 9.4 percent reported that they had between 101 and 150 local school districts. The remainder of the states were dispersed throughout the choices as depicted in Table 10. One study participant did not respond to this survey item. This set of findings clearly reveals the variance in terms of the number of local school districts within states and territories which may relate to differences in time and fiscal resources available to implement career education. In some instances, local districts or states with higher population densities or school populations of particular categorical concentrations, receive special funding attention from federal and state legislative and administrative bodies. This could be true in some instances for career education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of K-12 School Districts</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 - 200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 - 300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 - 350</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 - 400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 - 450</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 - 500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 550</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551 - 600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 - 650</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651 - 700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 - 750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751 - 800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 - 1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 - 1,500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,501 - 2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Establishment of Local Career Education Coordination Position

Table 11 presents the extent to which local school districts have established leadership positions for career education. Twenty nine of the study participants or 59.2 percent indicated 0-25 percent of the local school districts in their state had established career education coordinator director positions, while nine or 18.3 percent reported 26-50 of their local school districts had taken this action. Eleven of the study respondents or 20.5 percent indicated that career education coordinators/directors position existed in 51-100 percent of their local school districts. Five study participants did not respond to this question. These findings indicate that leadership at the local level for career education is a recognized need. Given the number of leadership positions at the local level, it can be assumed that career education does have "grass roots" support and clearly exceeds the level of leadership initiative and fiscal support provided by some of their respective state agencies. It is interesting to note that there was limited variance in the employment of local career education coordinators/directors in states employing their state coordinator of career education on a full-time versus part-time basis.
TABLE 11
PERCENT OF LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH DESIGNATED CAREER EDUCATION COORDINATOR/DIRECTOR POSITIONS IN 1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Local Districts with Local Career Education Coordinator/Director Positions</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full Time vs. Part Time Local Career Education Coordination

States indicating the presence of full-time local career education coordinators/directors do not compare favorably to the number of part-time positions as revealed in Table 12. Nine of the study participants or 18.4 percent stated that the established local career education coordinator/director positions were full-time, while 40 or 81.6 percent reported the positions as being part-time. Five study participants did not respond to this survey item. Table 12 also reveals that only six of the states or 12 percent fiscally support local career education coordinator/director positions, while 44 or 88 percent of the states do not provide fiscal support. Four study participants did not respond to this study item.

Major Constraints to Full Implementation

Eight major constraints to the full implementation of career education are identified in Table 13. Twenty-five of the states or 46.3 percent indicated reduction of fiscal resources as the major constraint. Eleven of the states or 20.4 percent identified the major constraint to be the attitude of local administrators. Other major constraints are identified in rank order of importance in Table 13.
TABLE 12
NUMBER OF STATES WITH LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT CAREER EDUCATION COORDINATOR/DIRECTOR POSITIONS IN 1977-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States with Local School District Career Education Coordinator/Director Positions</th>
<th>Not Supported by State Initiative</th>
<th>Supported by State Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13

**MAJOR CONSTRAINTS TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Constraint</th>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of fiscal resources</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of local administrators</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consistent state leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence of local teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of local teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from state legislature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of competent technical assistance from external sources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of quality curriculum and program materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These constraints clearly indicate that the problems identified in the hearings concerning the creation of the Career Education Incentive Act of 1977 were still persistent two years following its enactment. While several major constraints were identified, the problem of capacitating competent educational decision-makers and practitioners at all levels is the greatest challenge confronting career education. Regardless of resource levels committed, the success of career education programs will continue to depend upon the creativeness and leadership of local administrators, resource staff and classroom teachers.

Success of Implementation

The extent to which states have experienced success with the implementation of career education has varied among educational related program elements. Table 14 reports that 26 of the states or 48.2 percent as having the most success with the implementation of career education at the elementary school level. This finding positively reinforces the data reported in Table 9, wherein implementation of career education in local school districts was found to be highest in kindergarten through grade six. Guidance programs were ranked second with 14 of the states or 26 percent indicating implementation success. Intermediate schools, inservice teacher education and post secondary schools were all ranked equally with
Table 14

SUCCESS OF IMPLEMENTING CAREER EDUCATION RELATED PROGRAM ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Related Program Elements Ranked as Most Successful</th>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools (Curriculum Based)</td>
<td>26 48.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>14 26.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Schools (Curriculum Based)</td>
<td>4 7.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Teacher Education</td>
<td>4 7.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Schools (Curriculum Based)</td>
<td>4 7.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Linkages</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative School Program</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54 100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
regard to avenues for successful implementation with 4 state coordinators of career education or 7.4 percent respectfully ranking these three program elements. Community linkages and alternative school programs received the lowest rankings or current status as viable channels for the successful implementation of career education.

The demographic variables identified in Tables 1 through 14 were cross-tabulated in an effort to further delineate the data with regard to the study objectives. A summary of these demographic variables are presented in Table 15. The correlation coefficient of specific variable comparisons are reported in this summary Table. The specific areas of relationship of each set of variable comparisons are reported in Table 16 through 24.

Relationship of Reporting Channel and Perceived Consequences of Reduced Federal Support

The relationship of respective formal reporting channels with the expected consequences of reduced federal support for career education, yielded the results shown in Table 16. Cramer's V revealed a correlation coefficient of .27. Although a highly positive relationship was not found to exist, the results of this comparison are of interest. Twenty four of the study participants indicated that their formal reporting channel was through the Assistant Superintendent for Program. Of those found
# TABLE 15

**COMPARISON OF CAREER EDUCATION STUDY SELECTED VARIABLES AS TO DIRECTION OF RELATIONSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Education Study Variables</th>
<th>Direction of Relationship*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The respective reporting channel of state career education coordinators and their perceptions regarding reduced federal support of career education</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existence or non-existence of a local school career education administrator and the extent to which school districts have implemented career education in grades K-6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existence or non-existence of a local school career education administrator and the extent to which school districts have implemented career education in grades 7-9</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existence or non-existence of a local school career education administrator and the extent to which school districts have implemented career education in grades 10-12</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existence or non-existence of state advisory council on career education and the state level of funding for career education</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existence or non-existence of state advisory council on career education and the establishment of state legislation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existence or non-existence of state advisory council on career education and the establishment of a formal legislative position statement</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existence or non-existence of state advisory council on career education and the establishment of a formal state board position statement</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existence or non-existence of state advisory council on career education and the establishment of a formal state plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tables 16 through 24 report specific analysis for each of these relationships.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Channel</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief State School Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Vocational Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .27
to have this reporting arrangement, 17 of the study participants or 72 percent indicated that career education efforts would be significantly reduced as a result of reduced support from the federal government. Four of the study participants or 16 percent in this category indicated one or more of the following consequences would occur as a result of a reduction in federal support of career education:

1. The time needed to totally implement would be greatly increased (i.e. more students lost).

2. There really isn't much federal support. Basic support is verbal.

3. State might assume some of the fiscal burden to maintain state and local initiative.

4. Not much would happen in an organized planned way.

5. Career education will continue at the present level but with major unmet needs.

6. It would have little effect, since federal dollars have been minimal.

7. Since New Mexico has received very little federal funding in recent years, programs will continue, as part of minimum standards, but not as effectively as if we were allowed to accept federal funds.

Relationship of Local Career Education Administrator Position Establishment to Implementation of the Career Education Concept (Grades K-6).

Table 17 reports data which compared the extent of time allotted to designated local school career education
### TABLE 17

RELATIONSHIP OF THE EXISTENCE OF A DESIGNATED LOCAL SCHOOL CAREER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE SCHOOL DISTRICT HAS IMPLEMENTED CAREER EDUCATION IN GRADES K THROUGH 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Time Assigned as Designated Local School Career Education Coordinator</th>
<th>Extent Local School District has Implemented Career Education in Grades K through 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau B = .36
administrators with the extent to which the school district had implemented career education in grades K through 6. The Kendall's Tau B procedure revealed a correlation coefficient of .36 for the relationship between these variables. Thus, the greater the percent of time assigned for administration of career education, the greater the likelihood of implementation of career education in grades K through 6.

Twenty four of the study participants or 85 percent who indicated that up to 25 percent of their time was employed in completion of administrative tasks, reported that they had implemented career education in up to 50 percent of their K-6 educational programs. The same trend between percent of time allocated for administrative tasks versus extent of implementation prevails throughout the data reported in Table 17.

Relationship of Local Career Education Administrator Position Establishment to implementation of the Career Education Concept (Grades 7-9).

The existence or non-existence of designated local school career education administrators was compared to the extent to which school districts have implemented career education in grades 7 through 9 (see Table 18).
The Kendall's Tau B procedure revealed a coefficient of .38. Thus, the greater the percent of time assigned for administration of career education, the greater the likelihood of implementation of career education in grades 7 through 9. Table 18 shows 26 study participants stated they were assigned up to 25 percent time as career education administrators. Eighteen or 69 percent of these reported that career education had been implemented into the school curriculum up to 25 percent. Similar relationships exist between percentage of time employed as a career education administrator and extent to which the concept had been implemented.

Relationship of Local Career Education Administrator Position Establishment to Implementation of the Career Education Concept (Grades 10-12).

The relationship of percentage of local school career education administrator's designated time to the extent of implementation of career education in Grades 10-12 is reported in Table 19. Kendall's Tau B yielded a positive correlation coefficient of .20.

While the percentage of time assigned administrative responsibility did appear to impact uniformly at lower levels (19 of the study participants or 73 percent indicating 0-25 percent administrative designation also signified
| Percentage of Time Assigned as Designated Local School Career Education Coordinator | Extent Local School District has Implemented Career Education in Grades 7 through 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-25% | 26-50% | 51-75% | 76-100% | Total |
| No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 0-25% | 18 | 69 | 5 | 19 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 100 |
| 26-50% | 3 | 33 | 3 | 33 | 3 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 100 |
| 51-75% | 1 | 25 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 100 |
| 76-100% | 2 | 29 | 1 | 13 | 2 | 29 | 2 | 29 | 7 | 100 |

Kendall's Tau B = .38
### TABLE 19

**RELATIONSHIP OF THE EXISTENCE OF A DESIGNATED LOCAL SCHOOL CAREER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE SCHOOL DISTRICT HAS IMPLEMENTED CAREER EDUCATION IN GRADES 10 THROUGH 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Time Assigned as Designated Local School Career Education Coordinator</th>
<th>Extent Local School District has Implemented Career Education in Grades 10 through 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall’s Tau B = .20
0-25 percent level of implementation of the career education concept), the level of consistency was not reflected at higher levels of assigned administrative time. The percentage of assigned time for career education administration did not necessarily impact on the extent of implementation as reflected in Table 19.

**Relationship of Career Education Advisory Council to Level of Funding**

Table 20 examines the potential relationship of the existence of state advisory councils on career education to the state level of funding for career education. Cramer's V yielded a positive correlation coefficient of .28.

Of the 28 study participants indicating the existence of a state advisory council, 15 or 54 percent reported a funding level of $10,000 to $100,000, while 5 of the study participants or 71 percent indicating the absence of state advisory council also reported funding at the $10,000 to $100,000 level. Additionally, 5 of the states or 18 percent with state advisory councils indicated state funding in excess of $1,000,000, while 2 of those without advisory councils or 29 percent also reported funding at this level.
TABLE 20

RELATIONSHIP OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CAREER EDUCATION AND THE STATE LEVEL OF FUNDING FOR CAREER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Advisory Council on Career Education</th>
<th>State Level Funding for Career Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10- 51- 101- 201- 301- 500- Over 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. % No. % No. % No. % No. % No. % No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13 47 2 7 1 3 3 11 3 11 5 18 28 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 57 1 14 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 29 7 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .28
Relationship of State Advisory Council to Establishment of State Legislation

Fourteen of the 39 study participants or 36 percent in Table 21 who indicated their state had a state advisory council on career education, also reported their state had established specific legislation for career education. In addition, 25 of the study participants or 64 percent having state advisory councils also indicated their states had not established specific legislation for career education. The Phi Coefficient was found to be .004. The findings are neutral with regard to the influence of a state advisory council on career education on the establishment of state legislation for career education.

Relationship of State Advisory Council to Establishment of a Formal State Legislative Position Statement for Career Education

Table 22 reports that 8 of the states with state advisory councils on career education or 21 percent have established formal state legislative position statements on career education. This compares to 31 of the states with state advisory councils or 79 percent who report that formal state legislative position statements had not been transacted. Phi Coefficient was found to be .02.
### TABLE 21

RELATIONSHIP OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CAREER EDUCATION AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE LEGISLATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Advisory Council on Career Education</th>
<th>State Legislation for Career Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi Coefficient = .004

### TABLE 22

RELATIONSHIP OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CAREER EDUCATION AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FORMAL STATE LEGISLATIVE POSITION STATEMENT FOR CAREER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Advisory Council on Career Education</th>
<th>Formal State Legislative Position Statement for Career Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi Coefficient = .02
Relationship of State Advisory Council to Establishment of a Formal State Board of Education Position Statement

The statistical analysis resulted in a Phi Coefficient of .05 concerning the relationship of state advisory councils on career education and the establishment of formal position statements on career education by State Boards of Education (see Table 23). This is clearly depicted in the data which found that 27 of the 40 states or 68 percent with state advisory councils have established formal board position statements, while 8 of the 11 states or 73 percent without state advisory councils were also found to have formal State Board of Education Position Statements for Career Education.

TABLE 23

RELATIONSHIP OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CAREER EDUCATION AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FORMAL STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION POSITION STATEMENT FOR CAREER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established Advisory Council on Career Education</th>
<th>Formal State Board of Education Position Statement for Career Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi Coefficient = .05
Relationship of State Advisory Council to Establishment of a Formal State Plan

Table 24 reports that 37 of the states with state advisory councils on career education or 90 percent had completed formal state plans for career education. Nine of the states without established state advisory councils or 82 percent had also completed formal state plan for career education. The relationship was found to be positive with a Phi Coefficient of .10.

TABLE 24
RELATIONSHIP OF THE EXISTENCE OF A STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CAREER EDUCATION AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FORMAL STATE PLAN FOR CAREER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established Advisory Council on Career Education</th>
<th>Formal State Plan for Career Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi Coefficient = .10
Section II: Acceptance and Implementation of Goals for Career Education

In 1976, the United States Office of Career Education published ten (10) basic goals for career education. Given that these basic goals embrace the parameters of career education as defined for this study, the study participants were asked to state the extent to which they had implemented each of the ten goals in their respective state and the extent to which they personally agreed with the goal.

The specific study objective to which this section of the findings relate is:

Objective 5: The extent to which career education programs in states are being utilized and implemented in accordance with the goals identified by the United States Office of Education (USOE).

Data Categories

1. Level of acceptance of the ten (10) goals identified by the United States Office of Career Education (USOE).

2. Level of implementation of the ten (10) goals identified by the United States Office of Education (USOE).

---


Table 25 provides a summary of responses to the 10 United States Office of Career Education goals as related to relevance to implementation and level of acceptance by study participants. All but two study participants responded fully to this set of survey items. The data reported clearly shows that the majority of respondents are in full agreement with the 10 goals established with 8 of the 10 reported being accepted by greater than 70 percent of the study participants. It is also important to note that no study respondents disagreed totally regarding the importance of the 10 goals. The 4 goals that appeared to gain the highest level of acceptance were:

1. Equipped with a degree of self understanding and undertaking of educational-vocational opportunities sufficient for making sound career decisions.

2. Equipped with good work habits.

3. Competent in the basic academic skills required for adaptability in our rapidly changing society.

4. Equipped with career decision-making skills, job hunting skills, and job-getting skills.

The two goals that appeared to gain the lowest level of acceptance were:

1. Either placed or actively seeking placement in a paid occupation, in further education, or in a vocation consistent with their current career decisions.
TABLE 25
BASIC GOALS FOR CAREER EDUCATION IN TERMS OF RELEVANCE TO IMPLEMENTING THE CONCEPT AND ACCEPTANCE FOR USE BY STATES IN PROGRAM PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Goals for Career Education</th>
<th>Degree of Implementation</th>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Substantially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent in the basic academic skills required for adaptability in our rapidly changing society</td>
<td>6 11.1 24 44.4</td>
<td>19 35.2 3 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with good working habits</td>
<td>6 11.1 24 44.4</td>
<td>19 35.2 3 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a personally meaningful set of work values that foster in them a desire to work</td>
<td>4 7.4 19 35.2</td>
<td>27 50.0 2 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with career decision-making skills, job hunting skills, and job-setting skills</td>
<td>6 11.1 24 44.4</td>
<td>1 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Goals for Career Education</td>
<td>Degree of Implementation</td>
<td>Level of Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Substantially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with job specific occupational skills and interpersonal skills at a level that will allow them to gain entry into and attain a degree of success in the occupational society</td>
<td>5 9.3 16 29.6 29 53.7</td>
<td>2 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a degree of self-understanding and undertaking of educational-vocational opportunities sufficient for making sound career decisions</td>
<td>6 11.1</td>
<td>20 37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to them for continuing and recurrent education</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>19 35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Goals for Career Education</td>
<td>Degree of Implementation</td>
<td>Level of Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Substantially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either placed or actively seeking placement in a paid occupation, in further education, or in a vocation consistent with their current career decisions</td>
<td>4 7.4</td>
<td>12 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seeking to find meaning and meaningfulness through work in productive use of leisure time</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>10 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to themselves for changing career options of societal and personal constraints impinging on career alternatives</td>
<td>3 5.6</td>
<td>12 22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Actively seeking to find meaning and meaningfulness through work in productive use of leisure time.

The degree of implementation of the 10 goals considerably differed from the level of acceptance findings. No more than 6 of the states of 11.1 percent reported full implementation of any one of the 10 goals and 24 of the states or 44.4 percent was the highest level listed in Table 25 for one of the 10 goals. The highest level listed for not implementing one of the 10 goals was only 8 of the states or 14.8 percent.

Table 26 reports the ranking of the basic goals for career education in terms of the degree of association between acceptance and implementation. The rank order comparison of the first 4 basic goals for career education reported in Table 26 is not perfect. However, all 4 basic goals did rank among the top 4 of 10 for both acceptance and implementation. In addition, the percentages reported for acceptance only ranged 37 percent across the 10 basic goals. Further, the response range for fully and substantially implemented only varied by 24 percent.

Table 27 reports the ranking of the basic goals for career education in terms of the degree of association between acceptance and implementation. As apparent from data contained in Table 25, Kendall's Tau C yielded a
TABLE 26
RANK ORDER COMPARISON OF BASIC GOALS FOR CAREER EDUCATION
IN TERMS OF IMPLEMENTATION AND ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONCEPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Goals for Career Education</th>
<th>Level of Acceptance (Full Agreement)</th>
<th>Degree of Implementation (Fully or Substantially Implemented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Goals for Career Education</td>
<td>Rank %</td>
<td>Rank %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a degree of self-understanding and undertaking of educational-vocational opportunities sufficient for making sound career decisions.</td>
<td>1 87.0 3 48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent in the basic academic skills required for adaptability in our rapidly changing society.</td>
<td>3 83.3 1 55.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with good work habits.</td>
<td>3 83.3 4 42.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with career decision-making skills, job hunting skills, and job-getting skills.</td>
<td>3 83.3 2 50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a personally meaningful set of work values that foster in them a desire to work.</td>
<td>5.5 72.2 6.5 38.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to themselves for changing career options—of societal and personal constraints impinging on career alternatives.</td>
<td>5.5 72.2 9 27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to them for continuing and recurrent education.</td>
<td>7 70.4 5 40.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with job specific occupational skills and interpersonal skills at a level that will allow them to gain entry into and attain a degree of success in the occupational society.</td>
<td>8 64.8 6.5 38.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either placed or actively seeking placement in a paid occupation, in further education, or in a vocation consistent with their current career decisions.</td>
<td>9.5 50.0 8 29.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seeking to find meaning and meaningfulness through work in productive use of leisure time.</td>
<td>9.5 50.0 10 24.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**TABLE 27**

RANKING OF THE BASIC GOALS FOR CAREER EDUCATION IN TERMS OF DEGREE OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN ACCEPTANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCEPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Goals for Career Education</th>
<th>Degree of Association between Acceptance and Implementation of each of the Basic Goals for Career Education*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to themselves for changing career options—of societal and personal constraints impinging on career alternatives.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with job specific occupational skills and interpersonal skills at a level that will allow them to gain entry into and attain a degree of success in the occupational society.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a degree of self-understanding and undertaking of educational-vocational opportunities sufficient for making sound career decisions.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a personally meaningful set of work values that foster in them a desire to work.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with career decision-making skills, job hunting skills, and job-getting skills.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either placed or actively seeking placement In a paid occupation, In further education, or In a vocation consistent with their current career decisions.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seeking to find meaning and meaningfulness through work in productive use of leisure time.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent in the basic academic skills required for adaptability In our rapidly changing society.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to them for continuing and recurrent education.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with good work habits.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tables 28 through 37 report specific areas of relationship between acceptance and implementation of each of these Basic Goals.*
positive relationship between acceptance and implementation for all 10 basic goals. The respective coefficients, while positive, are moderately low with a narrow range of only .191 among the 10 basic goals.

The findings reported in Tables 25-27 do clearly indicate a high degree of acceptance by state coordinators of career education of the 10 basic goals for career education. Further, the level of implementation of these basic goals for career education is impressive given the funding and other constraints confronted by local and state leaders responsible for operationalizing the concept. Tables 23 through 37 report the specific areas of correlation between acceptance and implementation of each of the ten career education goals.

Goal of Basic Academic Skills

A positive relationship between program implementation and acceptance of the goal relating to competence in basic academic skills is reported for study participants in Table 28. Kendall's Tau C procedure yielded a .161 correlation coefficient. Twenty seven of the study participants or 51.9 percent responded that they were in full agreement with the goal and had fully or substantially implemented it as part of their state's career education program. Only 2 or 3.9 percent of the study participants indicating full agreement with the goal had not implemented it.
TABLE 28

COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION GOAL: COMPETENT IN BASIC ACADEMIC SKILLS REQUIRED FOR ADAPTABILITY IN OUR RAPIDLY CHANGING SOCIETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Fully Implemented</th>
<th>Substantially Implemented</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .161
state's career education program. Only 2 or 3.9 percent of the study participants indicating full agreement with the goal had not implemented it.

**Goal of Good Work Habits**

Table 29 depicts the relationship between acceptance and implementation regarding the goal equipped with good work habits yielded a correlation coefficient of .124. Twenty one of the study participants or 40.4 percent indicated full agreement and further had taken action to fully or substantially implement the goal. In addition, 23 of the study participants or 44.2 percent in the full agreement category had partially implemented the goal. Only 1 of the study participants or 1.9 percent fully agreed with the goal but had not implemented it.

**Goal of Meaningful Work Values**

Of the 39 study participants or 75 percent indicating full agreement to the goal relating to meaningful work values, 19 or 36.5 percent indicated they had fully or partially implemented the goal. Kendall's Tau C yielded a .24 correlation coefficient. Table 30 also reflects that 19 of the study participants or 36.5 percent in full agreement with the goal had only partially implemented it in their state's career education program.
TABLE 29

COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION
GOAL: EQUIPPED WITH GOOD WORK HABITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Fully Implemented</th>
<th>Substantially Implemented</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .124
TABLE 30
COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION GOAL: EQUIPPED WITH A PERSONALLY MEANINGFUL SET OF WORK VALUES THAT FOSTER IN THEM A DESIRE TO WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Level of Implementation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Substantially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .24
Goal of Career Decision-Making, Job Hunting and Job Getting Skills

Table 31 shows a favorable relationship between agreement and acceptance for the goal concerning the need for career decision-making skills, job hunting and job-getting skills. Kendall's Tau C correlation coefficient was .211. Twenty five of the study participants or 48.1 percent indicating full agreement had also fully or substantially implemented the goal. An additional 19 of the study participants or 36.5 percent in this category had at least partially implemented the goal.

Goal of Job Specific and Interpersonal Skills

Nineteen of the study participants or 36.5 percent who fully agreed with the goal concerning the need for job specific occupational skills and interpersonal skills, had also fully or substantially implemented it (see Table 32). Kendall's Tau C correlational coefficient was .315. Only 1 of the study participants or 1.9 percent responding at this level of acceptance had not implemented the goal. It is interesting to note that 28 of the study participants or 53.8 percent who either fully or to some extent agreed with the goal, had at least partially implemented it.
**TABLE 31**  
**COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION GOAL:**  
**EQUIPPED WITH CAREER DECISION-MAKING SKILLS, JOB HUNTING SKILLS, AND JOB-GETTING SKILLS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Level of Implementation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Substantially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>6 11.6</td>
<td>19 36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>2 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6 11.6</td>
<td>21 40.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .211
TABLE 32

COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION GOAL:
EQUIPPED WITH JOB SPECIFIC OCCUPATIONAL SKILLS AND INTERPERSONAL SKILLS
AT A LEVEL THAT WILL ALLOW THEM TO GAIN ENTRY INTO AND ATTAIN A DEGREE OF
SUCCESS IN THE OCCUPATIONAL SOCIETY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Fully Implemented</th>
<th>Substantially Implemented</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .315
Goal of Self-Understanding

Forty-six of the study participants or 88.5 percent responded that they were in full agreement with the goal relating to the importance of self-understanding and undertaking of educational-vocational opportunities as a basis for sound career decisions. Kendall's Tau C was found to be a positive correlation coefficient of .26. Twenty-six of these study participants or 50 percent also indicated they had fully or partially implemented the goals, while the remaining 20 or 38.5 percent had accomplished partial implementation (see Table 33).

Goal of Awareness of Continuing and Recurrent Educational Opportunities

Table 34 shows a minimal relationship between study participants level of acceptance and implementation of the goal "aware of means available to them for continuing and recurrent education." Kendall's Tau C yielded a positive correlation coefficient of .14. Seventeen of the study participants or 32.7 percent indicated full agreement with the goal and further that they had fully or substantially implemented it as part of their career education program. Nineteen of the study participants or 36.6 percent in this category had only partially implemented the goal.
TABLE 33

COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION GOAL:
EQUIPPED WITH A DEGREE OF SELF-UNDERSTANDING AND UNDERTAKING OF EDUCATIONAL-VOCATIONAL
OPPORTUNITIES SUFFICIENT FOR MAKING SOUND CAREER DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Level of Implementation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Substantially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .26
TABLE 34

COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION GOAL:
AWARE OF MEANS AVAILABLE TO THEM FOR CONTINUING AND RECURRENT EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Fully Implemented</th>
<th>Substantially Implemented</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .14
Goal of Placement

Only 11 of the study participants or 22.2 percent both fully agreed and also fully or partially implemented the goal relating to seeking placement opportunities (see Table 35). The Kendall's Tau C yielded a positive correlation coefficient of .206. Sixteen of the study participants or 30.8 percent who fully agreed with the goal had only partially or not taken actions to implement it as part of their programs.

Goal of Productive Use of Leisure Time

Only 26 of the study participants or 50 percent fully agreed with the goal relating to use of leisure time as reported in Table 36. The Kendall's Tau C procedure resulted in a positive correlation coefficient of .20. Only 9 of the study participants or 17.3 percent in this category indicated full or substantial implementation of the goal, while 17 or 32.7 percent reported only partial or not implemented.

Goal of Awareness of Career Options

Table 37 reports that 15 of the study participants or 28.9 percent were in full agreement with the goal of awareness of means available for changing career options, also had fully or substantially implemented the concept.
TABLE 35

COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION GOAL: EITHER PLACED OR ACTIVELY SEEKING PLACEMENT IN A PAID OCCUPATION, IN FURTHER EDUCATION, OR IN A VOCATION CONSISTENT WITH THEIR CURRENT CAREER DECISIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Level of Implementation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Substantially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .206
TABLE 36

COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION GOAL:
ACTIVELY SEEKING TO FIND MEANING AND MEANINGFULNESS THROUGH WORK IN PRODUCTIVE
USE OF LEISURE TIME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Level of Implementation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Substantially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>3 5.8</td>
<td>6 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>4 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 5.8</td>
<td>10 19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .20
TABLE 37

COMPARISON OF STATE ACCEPTANCE VERSUS IMPLEMENTATION OF CAREER EDUCATION GOAL:
AWARE OF MEANS AVAILABLE TO THEMSELVES FOR CHANGING CAREER OPTIONS—OF SOCIETAL
AND PERSONAL CONSTRAINTS IMPINGING ON CAREER ALTERNATIVES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Level of Implementation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Substantially Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau C = .315
The majority of study participants responding in this category (23 study participants or 44.2 percent) indicated they had only partially or not implemented the goal. Kendall's Tau C resulted in a positive correlation coefficient of .315.

Summary

The analysis of the data collected from state coordinators of career education in 54 states/territories were reported in this chapter. Data relating to the status of career education programs as well as the acceptance and implementation of goals established for career education, were analyzed and reported. The major findings of this chapter are summarized in Chapter V. Chapter V also includes conclusions and recommendations based on data reported in this chapter.

A number of national events which occurred in 1980, 1981 and projected to occur in 1982 could impact on the future of career education. In April, 1980, the new U.S. Department of Education was officially established. As a part of the organizational structure, the Office of Career Education was moved from its independent status within the U.S. Office of Education, to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary
Education in the new U. S. Department of Education.⁸

In 1981, the federal administration proposed a plan to eliminate the U.S. Department of Education and return the primary responsibility for education to individual states. The strategy for implementing the federal administration's plan included returning federal budgeted educational program funds to the states in block grants.⁹ Career education was listed as one of several federally supported educational programs to be included in the education block grants to states. One additional factor which could influence the progress of career education in the immediate future is its federal funding authority.

Under the Career Education Incentive Act of 1977, federal expenditures to states will cease at the end of September, 1983. The impact of these and other events which have occurred since 1979 when data collection was completed for this study, should be taken into consideration by the reader.


CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V summarizes the purposes, procedures and results of the study. In addition, conclusions and recommendations based on the findings in Chapter IV are reported.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine what state coordinators of career education perceived to be the most pervasive problems and priorities in implementing career education. The specific objectives included:

1. The extent to which formal mechanisms have been established in states which promote the development and implementation of career education.

2. The approximate total dollars invested in career education by individual states for the 1977-1978 school year.

3. The extent to which school districts have implemented career education.

4. The major constraints/successes experienced by state and local coordinators of career education in the implementation of career education programs.
5. The extent to which career education programs in states are being conceptualized and implemented in accordance with the goals identified by the United States Office of Education (USOE).

The 50 state coordinators of career education and the coordinators of career education in the six territories and the District of Columbia were the population surveyed in this study. The total response to the survey included 50 state coordinators of career education, 3 coordinators of career education in territories and the coordinator of career education in the District of Columbia. Data was collected for the study from April through October, 1979.

The survey research design was employed for the study. The study instrument was designed to collect data responsive to the objectives of the study. Questions and sub questions were developed for the survey questionnaire. A demographic section was designed to determine the status of state programs as well as a section which allowed state leaders to assess the 10 goals for career education identified by the United States Office of Education (USOE).¹ A Likert scale was

established for the response means for the 10 career education goals.

The data were analyzed utilizing percentages and measures of association to arrive at findings responsive to the objectives of the study. The details are presented in Chapter IV. Specifically, statistical measures of association were employed to determine the direction of relationship between selected demographic variables. The data revealed the following findings:

1. The majority of state career education coordinators are full time positions within their respective state departments of education.

2. The majority of state career education coordinators primarily have academic expertise in counseling and guidance, with educational administration as the second most dominant field of academic preparation represented.

3. Most state career education coordinators report to either the Assistant State Superintendent for Program or the State Director of Vocational Education.
4. The majority of the states/territories have implemented career education in their local school programs K-12, with the highest percentages of implementation reported for K-6 and 7-9 grade level programs.

5. Elementary school and career guidance programs are the areas in which career education has been implemented with the greatest degree.

6. As a result of local and state leadership initiatives, states/territories have established some career education coordinator/director positions at the local school district level, with 7 states indicating the presence of such positions in 76 to 100 percent of the school districts in their states.

7. The majority of local career education coordinators/directors have responsibilities in addition to career education.

8. Only a small percentage of local career education coordinator/directors positions are supported financially by state funds.
9. State funding for career education varies extensively from zero to over one million dollars, with 17 states indicating no current fiscal support for career education.

10. Reduction in fiscal resources and attitude of local administrators toward career education are perceived to be the two major constraints to the full implementation to career education.

11. Career education programs in states/territories would be significantly reduced if federal support for career education were withdrawn or reduced.

12. The majority of states/territories do not have formal position statements or legislation referencing commitment to career education.

13. The majority of states/territories have established career education advisory councils and are utilizing them moderately to extensively in influencing planning and program direction.

14. Analysis of the data indicated a positive relationship between the following study variables:

   --establishment of a local school career education administrator position and extent to which
the school district has implemented career education in grades K-6.

--establishment of a local school career education administrator position and extent to which the school district has implemented career education in grades 7-9.

--existence of a local school career education administrator and extent to which the school district has implemented career education in grades 10-12.

--state career education coordinators reporting channel and perceived anticipated consequences of reduced federal support for career education.

--existence of state advisory council on career education:

  o the state level of funding for career education.
  
  o establishment of a formal state legislative position statement for career education.
  
  o establishment of a formal state board of education for career education.
  
  o establishment of a formal state plan for career education.

15. The majority of state career education coordinators are in full agreement with
4 of the 10 United States Office of Career Education established goals including:

--equipped with a degree of self understanding and undertaking of educational-vocational opportunities sufficient for making sound career decisions.

--equipped with good work habits.

--competent in the basic academic skills required for adaptability in our rapidly changing society.

--equipped with career decision-making skills, job hunting skills, and job-getting skills.

16. The majority of state career education coordinators are in moderate agreement with 4 of the 10 United States Office of Career Education established goals including:

--equipped with a personally meaningful set of work values that foster in them a desire to work.

--equipped with job specific occupational skills and interpersonal skills at a level that will allow them to gain entry into and attain a degree of success in the occupational society.

--aware of means available to them for continuing and recurrent education.

--aware of means available to themselves for changing career option--of societal and personal constraints impinging on career alternatives.
17. The two United States Office of Career Education established goals that gained the lowest level of acceptance were:

--either placed or actively seeking placement in a paid occupation, in further education, or in a vocation consistent with their current career decisions.

--actively seeking to find meaning and meaningfulness through work in productive use of leisure time.

18. States/territories reported full or substantial implementation of the 10 United States Office of Career Education established goals with implementation at these levels ranging from 24.1 to 55.5 percent.

19. Only a limited number of state coordinators of career education indicated that they had not at least partially implemented all 10 of the United States Office of Career Education established goals.

Conclusions

The findings reported in Chapter IV were utilized as the base from which study conclusions have been drawn for each objective of the study.

Objective 1: Career education is not progressing at a rapid rate as initially predicted
by its "founders" in the early 1970's. This conclusion is supported by the fact that limited and uneven progress was made from 1975 to 1979 in terms of lack of conceptual clarity of career education, number and percentage of assigned time of personnel in career education leadership positions at state and local levels, established state legislation or position statements for the furtherance of career education and establishment/utilization of advisory councils on career education for program planning and direction. Both the literature review and study findings support this conclusion. An additional fact that contributes to this conclusion was the decision by three states (New Mexico, Nevada, South Dakota) not to accept federal funding support from the U.S. Office of Career Education in 1980.²

Objective 2: • Local and state fiscal support for career education has increased in 1977-78 as compared to 1974-75.

Objective 3: • Career education has not been extensively implemented into the curriculum in grades K-12.
  • Kindergarten through grade six have more extensively implemented career education into the curriculum than all other grade levels.

Objective 4: • The major constraints of reduction in fiscal resources and attitudes of local education administrators toward career education, must be overcome before implementation of the concept can be realized.
  • Elementary schools and guidance personnel have been the most receptive educational personnel in the implementing of career education.

Objective 5: • The U.S. Office of Education goals for career education are an integral part of the conceptual framework and implementation of career education programs nationally. While level of
acceptance and implementation varies from state to state, the career education goals have been implemented to some extent in K-12 educational programs in every state/territory included in this study.

Recommendations for Educational Leaders

It is the author's opinion that study findings and conclusions should provide administrative leaders at state and local educational levels with information pertinent to planning program development for career education. For example, administrators at all levels should be aware of the conceptual framework for career education and how to appropriately translate it into programs for various levels of student clientele. Based on the findings of this study and the author's opinion, the following recommendations are offered to educational administrators who have the responsibility and administrative authority to improve and expand the implementation of career education.

1. Chief State School Officer. As the elected or appointed state leader of education, chief state school officers must foster and nurture the career education concept within the total
state education program. Visibility and support from the state legislation, selection of capable state advisory council members, assurance of competent administrative staff and adequate budget allocation are all administrative functions which demand the attention of the chief state school officer. The passage of the Career Education Incentive Act of 1977 provided states with a wealth of guidelines and information needed for administering a statewide comprehensive career education program.

2. State Coordinators of Career Education. This professional represents the substantive and administrative leader for career education in the state. This person is expected to assure that the career education annual plan for the state is a comprehensive work plan that stimulates change and implementation of the concept at the local level. Further, the state coordinator must possess a thorough knowledge of all career, vocational and other pertinent legislative provisions that can provide support for the state and local career education program. The development of formal and informal communication networks throughout the state is a critical
need. Newsletters, magazines, flyers and telephone hotlines are communication means for sharing of resources, teaching strategies that work, and exemplary programs. Awareness programs should be developed for local career education administrators and practitioners to acquaint them with career education program activities occurring at state, regional and national levels. In addition, an awareness program should be developed to acquaint other state agency personnel of the breadth and impact of the career education program in their state. State advisory councils for career education is a body of concerned public leaders selected to assist with the development of the states career education program. State Coordinators must fully utilize state advisory council members both in terms of their collective and individual strengths in the evolution of the states career education program.

3. Local School District Administrators. Local school administrators in most instances control the current and future directions of the schools academic program. They are in a position to insure that career education is not treated as
a program option such as the arts or a specific science, but instead a concept to be implemented into all areas of the curriculum. It is also important that the school administrator understands the need and commitment to the hiring of a full-time administrator to manage the comprehensive career education program. This school administrator must also insure that administrators and practitioner at all levels are active participants in the awareness and implementation activities planned for the career education program. Finally, the local administrator must work with the school board to insure that specific fiscal resources are committed to the career education program for the purposes of personnel development and for the development and purchase of educational resources.

4. Local Coordinators of Career Education. Dr. Kenneth Hoyt and other educational leaders have often stated that career education must and is becoming a "grass roots" movement. The local coordinator is the educational manager and administrator responsible for the implementation of career education throughout the
school district. In this role, he or she must develop a clear conceptual framework and working definition of career education as it relates to the district's total educational program. A carefully developed district-wide work plan for the implementation of career education must be completed. This plan must be completed in cooperation with selected representatives from school practitioners, support staff and student groups, as well as community and local advisory committees. This must be a detailed plan which provides information with respect to specific expectations for all actors in its implementation and specifies learner outcomes by grade level. Full utilization must be made of career education advisory committee members who should also be encouraged to work with other community leaders who participate as members on other advisory committees to the school's program. Local administrators should continue to work toward bridging relationships with other educational delivery program leaders in the community,
as well as community leaders, who can contribute to the full implementation of career education in the school district.

Recommendations for Further Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the status of career education in 1979 as seen by the state coordinators of career education throughout the nation. The following recommendations are suggestions for further research on the status of career education.

1. A replication of this study should be conducted of state level leaders responsible for providing direction to the implementation of the career education concept in CETA and community-based organizations. Since funds for career education are specifically earmarked in the Youth Employment and Demonstration Act of 1977, and funding for career education model development in the early 1970's included home, community and residential settings in addition to school-based, there is a need to know if career education in these alternative learning settings has made progress during the past 10 years.
2. Utilizing similar survey research methodology, replicate this study of state career education coordinators five years following the funding of the Career Education Incentive Act of 1977. Such a study will provide the data needed to assess the impact of the legislation on increased levels of implementation of career education.

3. Survey local coordinators of career education to more accurately measure the extent of implementation of the concepts of career education in schools. This study should include both public and private school systems at the elementary and secondary school levels.

4. Survey the attitudes of chief state school officers, state school board chairpersons and state directors of vocational education concerning the continued viability and future directions of career education.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
Assessing Career Education's Progress

PART I: PROGRAM DATA

DIRECTIONS: Please complete the following questions in Part I as they pertain to your position and state.

01 Name of State (Please specify) ___________________________________

02 Title of state department staff member designated as State Career Education Coordinator (Please specify) ___________________________________

   _______ Full time (100% of time)
   _______ Part time (If yes, please specify other duties and percent of time)
   A. ____________________________ % of time _________________
   B. ____________________________ % of time _________________
   C. ____________________________ % of time _________________

03 Number of professional state staff specifically or partially assigned to Career Education (Please specify in terms of full time equivalents)

   Title % of Time
   A. ____________________________
   B. ____________________________
   C. ____________________________

04 Area of educational preparation of state staff member who is responsible for Career Education

   Counseling and guidance
   Vocational education
   Educational administration
   Curriculum development
   Secondary education
   Elementary education
   Other (Please specify) ____________________________
05 What is the reporting channel for Career Education within the state department of education? (The Career Education Coordinator reports directly to . . .)

________ Chief State School Officer
________ Assistant Superintendent for Program
________ Assistant Superintendent for Management
________ Director of Vocational Education
________ Director of Guidance and Counseling
________ Other (specify) _____________________________________

06 How many local school districts (K-12) are there within your state?

________ 001-050 ________ 051-100 ________ 101-150 ________ 151-200 ________ 201-250 ________ 251-300 ________ 301-350
________ 351-400 ________ 401-450 ________ 451-500 ________ 501-550 ________ 551-600 ________ 601-650 ________ 651-700
________ 701-750 ________ 751-800 ________ 801-1000 ________ 1001-1500 ________ 1501-2000 ________ over 2000
________ please specify

07 How many school districts in your state have infused Career Education into their curriculum (an integral part of all aspects of the curriculum)?

K-6 7-9 10-12

0 – 25% ________ ________ ________
26 – 50% ________ ________ ________
51 – 75% ________ ________ ________
76 – 100% ________ ________ ________

Is this information based on personal judgment or actual reports? (Please check one only.)

______ Personal judgment
______ Actual reports

08 What percentage of the school districts in your state have designated a Career Education Coordinator/Director position?

________ 0-25% ________ 26-50% ________ 51-75% ________ 76-100%

Are the majority of these designated Career Education Coordinators/Directors positions:

A. ________ Full time ________ Part time

B. Are these positions supported by state Career Education funds?

________ Yes ________ No

09 What is the current level of funds provided for Career Education from the state budget this current fiscal year?

________ $10,000-50,000 ________ $51,000-100,000 ________ $401,000-500,000
________ $101,000-200,000 ________ $501,000-1,000,000
________ $201,000-300,000 ________ Over $1,000,000
________ (Please specify)

10 Have state laws, policies, position statements, or state plans been formalized in your state for Career Education?

________ Yes ________ No State Legislation
________ Yes ________ No State Legislation Position Statement
________ Yes ________ No State Board of Education Position Statement
________ Yes ________ No State Plan

11 From the elements listed and those you may specify, rank order the elements viewed as major constraints to full implementation of Career Education in your state (e.g., 1 equals greatest constraint, while 10 equals least constraint).

________ Availability of quality curriculum and program materials
________ Reduction of fiscal resources
________ Attitude of local teachers
________ Competence of local teachers
12 From the related educational program elements listed and those you may
specify, please rank order them according to the degree of success you
have had in implementing Career Education in your state (e.g., 1 equals
most successful, while 12 equals least successful).

- Elementary school (curriculum based)
- Intermediate school (curriculum based)
- Secondary school (curriculum based)
- Postsecondary (curriculum based)
- Guidance
- Administration
- Community links
- Preservice teacher education
- Inservice teacher education
- Other (Please specify)

13 What do you anticipate would occur if federal support for Career Education
was withdrawn or significantly reduced? (Please check only one.)

- State would assume the additional fiscal burden to
  maintain local and state initiatives
- Local school systems would assume the additional
  fiscal burden to maintain local initiatives
- Career Education program efforts would be significantly
  reduced
- Other (specify)

14 Does your state have a state advisory council on Career Education?

- Yes ______ No_____

If yes, to what extent is the council utilized in planning and program
direction for Career Education?

- Extensive ______ Moderate ______ Limited

In what year was the state advisory council for Career Education
established?

197_______.

Who was the establishing authority? (Please specify.)

__________________________________________________________

How many meetings are scheduled for this fiscal year?

- 1  3  5
- 2  4
- more than 6

Does the advisory council have other responsibilities?

- Yes ______ No Guidance and Testing
- Yes ______ No Special Education
- Yes ______ No Vocational Education
- Yes ______ No Other (Please specify.)
PART II: CAREER EDUCATION OUTCOMES DATA

DIRECTIONS: Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director, Office of Career Education released a U.S. Office of Education monograph on Career Education (DHEW Publication, 1976). Within the monograph, Dr. Hoyt lists 10 basic goals for Career Education. In an attempt to determine the extent nationally that Career Education is being conceptualized and implemented according to the criteria USOE has identified, please respond to the USOE basic goals listed in sections A and B as they pertain to Career Education in your state.

SECTION A:

Directions: Please respond to these Career Education program related statements in terms of the level of acceptance as part of your state educational system's "philosophy" or "master plan" for educating youth and adults.

The following scale values are defined as follows for the purposes of this study:

1. Full Agreement The goal is implied in the plans for Career Education.
2. Some Agreement While the goal statement is not specifically stated in current plans, the intent is apparent in various aspects of the Career Education program.
3. No Agreement The goal is not consistent with Career Education program goals.

Please circle the appropriate response to each statement in each subcategory listed in Section A below as it relates to the level of acceptance by the state education governing body in your state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptance</th>
<th>Full Agreement</th>
<th>Some Agreement</th>
<th>No Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent in the basic academic skills required for adaptability in our rapidly changing society.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with good work habits.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a personally meaningful set of work values that foster in them a desire to work.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with career decision-making skills, job hunting skills, and job-getting skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with job specific occupational skills and interpersonal skills at a level that will allow them to gain entry into and attain a degree of success in the occupational society.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a degree of self-understanding and undertaking of educational-vocational opportunities sufficient for making sound career decisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to them for continuing and recurrent education.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either placed or actively seeking placement in a paid occupation, in further education, or in a vocation consistent with their current career decisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seeking to find meaning and meaningfulness through work in productive use of leisure time.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to themselves for changing career options—of societal and personal constraints impinging on career alternatives.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION B:

Please respond to these Career Education program related statements in terms of the degree of implementation of the concept in your state.

The following scale values are defined as follows for the purpose of this study:

1. Fully Implemented The goal is apparent in almost all Career Education programs, e.g., over 76%.
2. Substantially Implemented The goal is apparent in the majority of Career Education programs, e.g., 51% to 75%
3. Partially Implemented The goal is apparent in some Career Education programs, e.g., 26% to 50%
4. Not Implemented The goal is apparent in only a few of the Career Education programs, e.g., 25% or less.

Please circle the appropriate response to each statement in each subcategory listed in Section B below as it relates to the degree of implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Implementation</th>
<th>Fully Implemented</th>
<th>Substantially Implemented</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent in the basic academic skills required for adaptability in our rapidly changing society.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with good work habits.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a personally meaningful set of work values that foster in them a desire to work.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with career decision-making skills, job hunting skills, and job-getting skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with job specific occupational skills and interpersonal skills at a level that will allow them to gain entry into and attain a degree of success in the occupational society.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipped with a degree of self-understanding and undertaking of educational-vocational opportunities sufficient for making sound career decisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to them for continuing and recurrent education.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either placed or actively seeking placement in a paid occupation, in further education, or in a vocation consistent with their current career decisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seeking to find meaning and meaningfulness through work in productive use of leisure time.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of means available to themselves for changing career options—of societal and personal constraints impinging on career alternatives.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 8, 1979

Dear Colleague:

As evidenced by the extensive participation in the U.S. Commissioner of Education's National Career Education Conference in Houston, Texas in November, 1976, Career Education is "alive and well" in the United States. Evidence in terms of federal, state and local initiatives appears to support this conclusion. The establishment and continuation of the U.S. Office of Career Education and continuing federal legislative support including passage of the Elementary and Secondary Career Education Act of 1977, has added considerable momentum to the full implementation of career education in educational settings.

Recent efforts have been undertaken by federal and state education agencies to document historical and current status of the implementation of career education in educational settings. It is the purpose of this study to update and expand the information data base relevant to the status of career education.

Given your leadership role in career education in your state, your assessment of the current status of career education as well as your perceptions of the entire concept, are sought for inclusion in this study. Please complete the enclosed survey questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

I appreciate your shared concern for increasing the efficacy of career education through participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Anne Hansen
Career Education Consultant
4519 Maynard Road
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Enclosure
April 4, 1979

Dear Colleague:

Approximately three weeks ago you were mailed a survey questionnaire concerning the status of career education. To date, I have not received your reply. For your convenience, I have enclosed an additional copy of the questionnaire and a self addressed stamped envelope.

I appreciate your cooperation in the completion of the survey.

Sincerely,

Anne Hansen
4519 Maynard Road
Delaware, Ohio 43015

AH:mja
Enclosure
May 7, 1979

Dear Colleague:

To date I have not received the survey questionnaire concerning the status of career education mailed to you on March 8 and April 4, 1979. Forty-six states, District of Columbia, and three territories have returned the questionnaire for inclusion in the status report. I have enclosed an additional copy of the questionnaire and a self addressed stamped envelope in the event that you have not received earlier mailings.

I appreciate your cooperation in the completion of the survey.

Sincerely,

Anne Hansen
4519 Maynard Road
Delaware, Ohio 43015

AH:mja
Enclosure
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Kosier, Mary Memorandum to Members dated September 26, 1980, National Vocational Guidance Association.


Marland, Sidney P. Career Education: Prospect and Retrospect, Distinguished Lecture Series #3, Columbus, Ohio: Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, March, 1975.


State of Arizona, Senate Bill 5, 30th Legislature, First Session, July 1, 1971.


