A study was made of the effect of career infusion on proficiency test scores in eight areas for seniors in a high school English class in Texas. The experimental group had not passed the proficiency tests and were considered at risk for dropping out of school. Two control groups were used: other at-risk senior English students and an 11th-grade English honors class. For approximately 3 months, career awareness activities were infused into the English curriculum for the experimental group. The group also visited community workplaces and then participated in 2-hour daily work at these workplaces. In addition, graduates in counseling worked with the students. The study found that the experimental group with career awareness training outperformed the at-risk control group on the posttest in five of the eight subtests. The experimental group with career awareness training outperformed the honors group on the posttest in three subtests and tied in one of the eight subtests. The experimental group experienced test score declines for four tests, possibly because the training did not address these subtest scales. Additionally, the experimental group generally outperformed the at-risk and honors control groups in subtest score improvements between pre- and posttesting. Partially as a result of the study, the high school moved to make career awareness training part of the English curriculum and hired a school-business coordinator. Recommendations were made to avoid testing at the end of the school year and to standardize the testing procedures. (KC)
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Drs. Goodwin, Bruhn, Henderson and McGee met with the Coordinator of Career and Technology Education of an Independent School District (one of the 100 largest districts in Texas) on March 2, 1994. The purpose was to develop plans for conducting a Community Based Organization Program funded by the Texas Education Agency, to be called the "Careers for At-Risk Students (CARS)" Project. This grant was designed to provide attitudinal and motivational prevocational training to "at-risk" and special populations included within senior English classes.

The target of the grant was a senior English class with students (16 years and older) who had not passed the English portion of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) test, which is required by state law in order to graduate. This treatment group received training in employability and leadership skills. Mentor sites were established with local businesses to provide "hands-on" training, with students working as interns two hours per day. A liaison between students and businesses helped followed-up on the placements to facilitate the relationships between students and the businesses.

Business involved included banks, an Education Service Center, the Chamber of Commerce, the hospital, a state university, a furniture store, a car dealership, an automobile parts store, a florist, department stores, a grocery store, a beauty salon, a hardware store, a computer store, a printing shop, a child development center, and a drug store.

For approximately three months of instruction, the English class utilized career education infusion in the curriculum (Zunker, 1990), providing career awareness, on-the-job behavior training, and how to do interviews. The class visited the high school career center several times and took five field trips, including trips to a technical school, a state university, and a prison unit (the largest employer in the community).

The Career Development Inventory (CDI) (Super et al., 1979) was administered as a pre- and post-test to assess students on eight dimensions. Those dimensions included: Career Planning (CP); Career Exploration (CE); Career Decision-Making (DM); World-of-Work Information (WW); a combination of the CP and CE scores called Career Development Attitudes (CDA); a combination of DM and WW called Career Development Knowledge and Skills (CDK); a combination of the CP, CE, DM, and WW scores called Career Orientation Total (COT); and Knowledge of Preferred Occupation (PO). The description of each subtest as listed in the computerized score print-out was as follows:

Career Planning (CP): How involved you are in thinking about your future and making career plans.
Career Exploration (CE): How able you have been to find and utilize good sources of career planning information.
Career Decision-Making (DM): How able you are to solve problems involving vocational and educational choices.
World-of-Work Information (WW): How much you know about jobs and what it takes to find and succeed at one.
Career Development Attitudes (CDA): A combination of your CP and CE scores.

Career Development Knowledge and Skills (CDK): A combination of your CDM and WW scores.

Career Orientation Total (COT): A combination of your scores on the CP, CE, DM, and WW scales.

Knowledge of Preferred Occupation (PO): How much you know about occupations in the group to which your preferred occupation belongs. (Super et al., 1986, p. 1)

The pre-testing with the CDI started during the week of April 5. All three groups (experimental at-risk, control at-risk, and control honors) were tested. McGee and Henderson developed the research program to evaluate program effectiveness through the pre- and post-test statistical analysis of scores obtained on the CDI.

The Differential Aptitude Test Fifth Edition (DAT) (Psychological Corporation, 1991) was administered on Friday, April 15 to students in the experimental group. Several students missed this session and follow-up testing sessions for the DAT were scheduled for the following week. The DAT scores, along with the DAT Interest Inventory, provided aptitude and interest data for the students.

Dr. Bruhn organized counseling interns (nearing completion of the masters degree and counselor certification) to provide career testing and counseling for the students in the experimental group. The Counseling Interns were enrolled in, or had completed, Supervised Practicum (an advanced level course) and received "client contact hours" for conducting the counseling. Dr. Bruhn was responsible for coordination and supervision of the students.

Each student in the experimental group was assigned to an intern. Interns volunteered to work with one to five students based on their time and availability.

The career testing and counseling was provided by the Interns starting the week of April 25. Each intern spent three periods (approximately one hour per period) with the students in the experimental group. During the counseling sessions, the counselors attempted to: 1) assess the goals of the individuals; 2) interpret aptitude and interest inventory scores (DAT and the interest inventory which accompanies the DAT); 3) help the student explore possible occupations and careers that were identified through the first two steps; 4) conduct another assessment regarding the student's needs, e.g., did the student need help in learning to write a resume, or develop effective interviewing skills; and, 5) address the needs identified in the preceding step.

Prior to meeting with the students, Interns met with the school district Career and Vocational Coordinator. The Coordinator introduced the Interns to the High school staff and informed the interns of procedures to be followed when in the
high school building. Interns counseled students from 8:15 am to 9:15 am at the High School during the english class.

The post-test administration of the CDI was administered in May within the last ten full days of school.

Indirect Effects From the Program: Four of the senior high english went to workshops to learn ways to infuse career materials and activities into the curriculum. Six months later, four additional english teachers received similar training. Thus, a number of english teachers are now infusing career materials into the high school curriculum. In addition, the school district added a new position for a school-to-work transition coordinator.
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SUMMARY OF VOCATIONAL STUDY

Methods and Procedures

Question
Will career awareness training improve student scores on a Career Development Inventory (CDI)?

Sample
This sample included 15 students in 11th grade honors English, and 31 at risk 12th grade English students. All students were from Huntsville High School during the spring of 1994. All at risk students were also in the school's vocational program.

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to compare pre and post career awareness test scores for an experimental (treated) group with a control (untreated) group of at risk students. The honors students served as a 2nd control (untreated) group.

Treatment
Career awareness training for the experimental group conducted after the pretest was the treatment.

Test Administered
The Career Development Inventory (CDI) with eight (8) subtests standard score scales was administered. Testing occurred in February and May of 1994.

Test of Probability
A t-test was used with a probability of .05 or less being considered significant (p<.05). Frequency, mean, median, and standard deviation were also reported.

Research Design
\[ R \ M_1 \rightarrow T \rightarrow M_2 \] (experimental group)
\[ R \ M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \] (control group)
\[ R \ M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \] (honors control group)
Review of Data

1. When the experimental group was compared to the control group of at risk students before training, only the PO scale of the CDI was significantly different (p=.012).

2. When the experimental group was compared to the control group of at risk students after training, the CE scale (p=.035) and the CDA scale (p=.036) were both significantly different. The CP scale was p=.063.

3. When the control group mean scores for the first test were compared to themselves on the second test, the mean scores of the control group declined in all eight subtest areas. This decline in scores was significant in six of the eight subtest areas and almost significant (.074) in a seventh area (CE scale).

4. When the honors group mean scores for the first test were compared to the second test, the mean scores of the honors group improved in the CP, CE, and CDA scale scores and declined in five scale score areas.

5. When the experimental group was compared to the honors group, the experimental group outscored the honors group on the post (2nd) test on the CP, CE, and CDA scales. They tied the honors group on the CDK scale and were outscored by the honors group on the DM, WW, COT, and PO scales.

6. When the experimental group was compared to itself (pre and post test), the post test outscored the pretest on four subtests: CP, CE, CDA, and PO scales. Only on one subtest (WW) were the results statistically significant.

Findings

1. The experimental group with career awareness training out performed the control group on the post test in five of the eight subtests.

2. The experimental group with career awareness training out performed the honors group on the post test in three scales and tied in one of the eight subtests.

3. Subtests DM, WW, CDK, and COT experienced test score declines for the experimental group between the pre and post test. It is possible the training session (treatment) did not address these subtest scales.

4. The experimental group generally out performed the control and honors groups in subtest score improvements between pre and post testing.
5. Training for the experimental group directed itself to the subtests CE, CP, and CDA. All of the subtest scores exceeded the national mean scores and had probabilities of .035 (CE), .063 (CP), and .036 (CDA).

6. The honors group improved in three of the subtest scores (CP, CE, and CDA) between the pre and post testing. This suggests the honors group learned from the awareness gained on the first (pre) test.

7. The control group with no training experience subtest scores declined in all eight subtests. It is possible the test administrator did not motivate the students to apply themselves.

**Question Answered**

Based on the preponderance of evidence, career awareness training maintained and/or improved student test performance significantly better than the two untrained control groups.

**Problems Observed**

1. Control group scores dropped in all eight subtest areas. This may be explained by the events that influenced the test results during the second testing in May.
   A. A senior in the control group class was killed shortly before the second testing.
   B. Testing occurred in mid-May and the control group was not tested by the project administrators. The regular teacher gave the test because of confusion over the student's death.

2. Test scores on subtests DM, WW, CDK and COT dropped in all three groups between the first and second testing.
   A. It is possible training for the experimental group did not address these test areas. Test reliability may also be in need of review.
      (1) DM--Assesses ability to apply principles of career planning to situations.
      (2) WW--Assesses knowledge of career development tasks, occupational structure, sample occupations and techniques for getting and holding a job.
      (3) CDK--Assesses how to make career decisions and mores of work.
      (4) COT--Measures five dimensions in vocational and career maturity.
3. Three subtest scores on the posttest for all three groups were below the national norm (WW, CDK, and COT).
   A. Although these scores were below national mean score norms, they were within the standard error of measurement for each subtest score

Recommendation for future training
1. Avoid end of the year testing (mid to late May).
2. Standardize test administration: 1st and 2nd testing, test administrators, instruction and the like.
3. Treatment intervention did not appear to address content measured in four subtest. Identify subtest training areas in future studies.

Tables
Tables for data entered and tests run are attached. They are summarized in Table I and Table II.
Table I: Career Development Inventory (CDI) t-test Values and Probabilities Significant for Three Groups: Experimental, Control, and Gifted. Huntsville High School (Texas), Spring 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>CP (Pre and Post) t value sig</th>
<th>CE t value sig</th>
<th>DM t value sig</th>
<th>WW t value sig</th>
<th>CDA t value sig</th>
<th>CDK t value sig</th>
<th>COT t value sig</th>
<th>PO t value sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-2</td>
<td>2.17 .039</td>
<td>1.86 .074</td>
<td>2.21 .036</td>
<td>5.38 .000</td>
<td>2.26 .032</td>
<td>3.83 .001</td>
<td>3.86 .001</td>
<td>.82 .422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp-1</td>
<td>.62 .537</td>
<td>.06 .949</td>
<td>1.29 .208</td>
<td>.76 .456</td>
<td>.35 .732</td>
<td>1.23 .228</td>
<td>1.09 .284</td>
<td>2.68 .012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp-2</td>
<td>1.95 .063</td>
<td>2.24 .035</td>
<td>.47 .644</td>
<td>.31 .756</td>
<td>2.22 .036</td>
<td>.11 .910</td>
<td>1.19 .245</td>
<td>1.18 .250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors-2</td>
<td>.34 .739</td>
<td>.39 .700</td>
<td>3.29 .003</td>
<td>3.24 .003</td>
<td>.44 .666</td>
<td>3.47 .002</td>
<td>1.88 .070</td>
<td>2.03 .052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Significance is defined as p<.05.
Table II: Career Development Inventory (CDI) Mean Scores and Standard Deviations. Huntsville High School (Texas), Spring 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups (Pre and Post)</th>
<th>CP M</th>
<th>CE M</th>
<th>DM M</th>
<th>WW M</th>
<th>CDA M</th>
<th>CDK M</th>
<th>COT M</th>
<th>PO M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp-1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp-2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors-1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors-2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Norms</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M= Mean Score
SD= Standard Deviation

Standard Error of Measurement: First Number=11th Graders
Second Number= for 12th Graders
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