

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 439 373

CG 029 950

AUTHOR Liu, Shu-Hui
TITLE A Descriptive Approach on Career View.
PUB DATE 1998-12-00
NOTE 7p.; In: "Relating in a Global Community." Proceedings of the International Conference on Counseling in the 21st Century (7th, Sydney, Australia, December 29-31, 1998); see CG 029 933.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Choice; *Career Counseling; *College Students; Decision Making; Foreign Countries; Higher Education
IDENTIFIERS Hollands Theory of Occupational Choice; Taiwan

ABSTRACT

This paper describes research on two studies to help describe how college and graduate students think and what they do about their careers. The study examined the following two questions: (1) What are college students' career views in general? and (2) What are the differences on career view among six Holland types? Content analyses of these career views resulted in the refined Career View Framework. The results confirm the existence of various types of career views. Differences on career view among six Holland types were found, with the pattern congruent with the Holland typology. Two limitations were noted in the study. The first was raised from the research instrument, and the second was related to cultural differences. The paper states that the Career View Framework was helpful in identifying individual career views, and points to the need for career counselors to be sensitive to their own career views as well as the clients'. (Contains 12 references and 2 tables.) (JDM)

W. Evraiff

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Descriptive Approach on Career View

Shu-Hui Liu, Ph.D.

Dr. Liu is an associate professor at the Department of Guidance and Counseling, National Chang-Hwa University of Education, Taiwan, Republic of China.

Rationality has long been the tradition in career literature. All of the founders of substantial career theories, such as Super, Holland, and Krumboltz, have placed great importance on being rational (Spokane, 1996). The majority of career-planning books recommends consistently the virtue of being systematic and logic (i.e., Crites, 1981; Gysbers & Moore, 1987; Katz, 1993; Peterson, Sampson, & Reardon, 1991).

Along the mainstream of rationality, diverse voices have come out here and there (Krieshok, 1998). Some researchers began to view the rational approach as prescriptive and try to find out the real decision-making process in everyday life. The first significant attempt was made by Tiedeman's study on individualized career development in the 1950s, followed by Dinklage's study on decision-making styles in the 1960s (cited in Sharf, 1992) and subsequent studies in the 1970s and 1980s (i.e., Arroba, 1977; Rubinton, 1980).

The reflections on the rationality tradition seem to be limited to the area of career decision-making only. To broadly describe how people actually think and do about their career, the researcher has conducted two preliminary studies (Liu, 1996, in process). Data of those studies were collected from 12 graduate students and 14 undergraduates, respectively. Content analyses of those career view papers resulted in the refined Career View Framework.

Although the model was comprehensive, a whole picture of college students' career review was not available due to the small sample size of previous two studies. This study attempted to describe the general phenomenon about career view in a larger scale. This study was also intended to further define possible heterogeneous groups on career view. Holland's typology was chosen because his types represented not only vocational traits but also integrative personality types (Spokane, 1996).

In sum, this study examined the following two questions: (1) what was college students' career view in general? and (2) what were the differences on career view among six Holland types?

Method

Subjects

The targeted population was college students in Taiwan. Cluster sampling was applied with stratification of school type (public vs. private), type of department (determined by first letter of Holland code derived from the Interest Inventory by Chin, Lin, Chen, and Ou in 1994), and grade (1 to 4).

A sample of 824 students in 8 universities was obtained. Of these respondents, 246 were freshmen, 243 sophomores, 145 juniors, and 190 seniors. According to the self-rating, 135 were realistic (R), 136 Investigative (I), 176 Artistic (A), 214 Social (S), 109 Enterprising (E), and 49 Conventional (C).

Measures

The Career View Questionnaire was constructed based on the refined Career View Framework

ED 439 373

CG029950



(Liu, in process). The Questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part collected demographic information, including sex and age. The second part was about career view, including 23 process items and 15 direction items rated on a polarized 6-point Likert scale. The statements of items were derived from papers in the preliminary study (Liu, in process) and revised by the researcher and two experts. Here was the sample item.

Life is under one's control; one should try hard to make control.	1	2	3	4	5	6	Life is out of one's control; one should be content with what one has.
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

The third part was the self-rating on Holland type. Descriptions of the six types were derived from Holland's summary (Spokane, 1996) and Interest Inventory (Chin, Lin, Chen, & Ou, 1984), which were revised by the researcher and two experts. The respondents were asked to choose the most similar type.

Procedure and Data Analyses

The Questionnaire was administered in a group form. The procedure took about 15 to 30 minutes. Data analyses were processed with the SPSS for Windows 7.0. Means and standard deviations of the whole sample were used to answer question one. For question two, multivariate ANOVA were applied. As the significant type effects were found, corresponding univariate ANOVA were conducted, and would be followed by Scheffe post hoc tests if appropriate. The above analyses were examined at the significance level of .05.

Results and Discussion

Career View in General

The means and standard deviations on career view were presented in Table 1 and 2. The means below 3 or above 4 were considered as attitudes supporting the corresponding polarization description because 3.5 was the mid-point on the 6-point scale.

The sided means revealed the following characteristics in college students' career view: (1) survival policy: pursuing control, (2) interaction policy: balancing competition and cooperation, (3) decision-making style: the self-determined and rational approach, (4) actualization principle: clear but not fixed directions and plans, (5) actualization strategy: the active but safe approach, (6) coping with uncertainty: acceptance and preparation, (7) coping with frustration: positive attitudes, (8) origins of life meanings: self-determination and responsibility, (9) retrospective approach: the focus on subjective feelings, and (10) life goals: individualized and multiple divergent goals.

Table 1 Pooled means and type differences on process items

Dimension/Item	Pooled		ANOVA		Homogeneous Groups
	Mean	SD	F	P	
Survival policy					
1 Be content with what one has	2.26	1.26	2.20	.05	E-S-A-I-R S-A-I-R-C
Interaction policy					
7 Fight with reality impacts or restrictions	3.18	1.49	1.83	.10	
8 Cooperate with others	4.1	1.3	2.9	.01	E-R-A-C-S-I
Decision-Making Style					
15 Follow others' opinions or fate	2.06	1.01	2.23	.05	E-A-S-I-R-C
16 Rely on intuition	2.14	1.02	.89	.49	
17 Emphasize outside conditions	2.66	1.24	.37	.87	
18 Make decisions later	2.06	.89	1.43	.21	
19 Overhaul and revise previous decisions	4.6	1.3	1.5	.18	
Actualization Principle					
9 Have a concrete plan	3.79	1.58	1.03	.40	
10 Renew developing directions constantly	3.00	1.32	3.26	.01	R-C-S-E-I-A
11 Don't have to have clear goals all the times	2.03	1.07	3.42	.01	E-S-R-A-I-C
12 Point out developing directions	2.94	1.53	1.39	.22	
13 Plan while coming to it	3.29	1.46	2.27	.05	E-C-S-R-A-I
14 Make future life better	4.2	1.4	.5	.72	
Actualization Strategy					
20 Go for the goal and spare no effort	2.26	1.09	1.51	.19	
21 Search for or create opportunities	2.86	1.22	6.06	.00	C-R-I-E-S-A
22 Carry on conservatively	3.63	1.51	15.75	.00	A-E-S-R-I-C
Coping with Uncertainty					
3 Circumstances will change	2.96	1.41	.58	.71	
4 Be bad to be variable	2.49	1.08	4.16	.00	A-E-S-I-R-C
5 Have everything prepared	4.52	1.35	2.40	.04	C-I-R-A-S-E
6 Think of the best result first	2.6	1.2	2.4	.04	I-R-E-A-S-C
Coping with Frustration					
23 Trial and frustration are challenging	4.88	1.03	2.63	.02	C-R-I-E-S R-I-E-S-A
24 Stand up to frustration persistently	3.31	1.42	1.21	.30	

Table 2 Pooled means and type differences on direction items

Dimension/Item	Pooled		ANOVA		Homogeneous Groups
	Mean	SD	F	P	
Origins of Life Meanings					
2 Life duties are selected by oneself	3.78	1.54	.98	.43	
25 Carry out the mission assigned	2.44	1.29	.39	.86	
26 Actual behavior is more important	2.58	1.31	.58	.71	
Retrospective Approach					
27 Outcomes are more important	2.30	1.30	4.04	.00	A-S-I-R-E-C
28 Current living quality is more important	2.89	1.25	1.06	.38	
29 Try the best to be excellent and perfect	2.43	1.26	1.72	.13	
30 Satisfaction can be evaluated rationally	2.41	1.32	2.63	.02	A-E-S-R-I E-S-R-I-C
31 To achieve life satisfaction is not hard	3.35	1.47	2.70	.02	C-R-I-A-E-S
Career Goals					
32 Fulfill the expectations from cared ones	2.77	1.31	1.42	.21	
33 Let go and chase for whatever one wants	3.43	1.54	6.15	.00	C-S-I-R-E-A
34 Keep stable and conservative	2.49	1.19	8.58	.00	A-E-S-I-R-C
35 Live an ordinary and smooth life	2.88	1.27	9.32	.00	A-E-S-I S-I-R-C
36 Look for comfort and happiness	3.94	1.42	5.65	.00	E-C-A-I-R-S
37 Develop different goals subsequently	2.90	1.52	1.70	.13	
38 Live a relaxing and simple life	3.22	1.36	4.73	.00	E-A-S-I A-S-I-R-C

In comparisons with the prescriptive view derived from career literature, college students' view was found to be substantially different. The only similarities lied in survival policy and decision-making style. As to the rest parts, the major differences were the followings. (1) They showed more willingness to cooperate. (2) They asserted the motivating value of planning but didn't place too much emphasis on details of planning. (3) They liked to be active but cared about security as well. (4) They reflected more on themselves and viewed the uncertainty in a positive way. (5) They faced difficulty in a positive way. (6) They addressed the selection about attitudes toward life instead of life duties themselves. (7) They didn't insist to have control although they did pursue control. (8) They tried to find the golden middle way between want's and should's. In sum, they tended to combine different approaches and balance opposite values. They certainly asserted the value of rationality, but they were also concerned about other values.

Career View of Six Holland Types

A multivariate ANOVA of 23 career view process items resulted in Wilk's $\lambda=.76$ ($F=1.87$, $P=.00$, $ES=.05$). Corresponding univariate ANOVA indicated significant differences on 12 items, but heterogeneous groups were identified for two items only (Table 1). Compared with the E, the C placed more emphasis on the attitude to be content with what one has. Compared with the A, the C had more negative feelings toward frustration.

A multivariate ANOVA of 23 career view direction items resulted in Wilk's $\lambda = .79$ ($F = 2.49$, $P = .00$, $ES = .05$). Again, corresponding univariate ANOVA and Scheffe post hoc tests identified heterogeneous groups for three items only (Table 2). Although the C didn't expect to have a checklist about satisfactory life, they didn't address subjective feelings to the extent the A did. The C enjoyed a relaxing and simple life, while the E prefer a busy and enriched life. Both the A and E like a life full of excitement and variation more than the C and R.

It was noteworthy that there were 15 items showed significant main effects on univariate ANOVA but failed to identify heterogeneous groups with post hoc tests. However, an inspection on means of six types revealed a consistent pattern. The C was found to have the largest or smallest means in 11 of the 15 items, and the second largest or smallest in 3 of the rest items. This clear pattern indicated there might be substantial but not significant type differences undetected.

To put together, the above comparisons showed the C was quite different from the other types, while the A and E were the most opposite types to the C. Moreover, the pattern of differences on career views among six Holland types was in congruence with previous studies on the characteristics of the Holland types (Spokane, 1996).

Further attention was placed on the similarity between each Holland type and the prescriptive view. No type was found to be consistently more congruent with the prescriptive view than other types, which seemed to indicate the lack of association between Holland's typology and the preference toward rationality.

Conclusion

College students' career view was more moderate and divergent than the prescriptive scholastic view. Rationality was not their only important value. Differences on career view among six Holland types were found, with the pattern congruent with the Holland typology. Such findings might indicate the association between vocational interest and career view. There was no association between Holland's typology and rationality on career view.

The findings were restricted by two major limitations of this study. The first limitation raised from the research instruments. The mid-point of the 6-point scale might not be the true mid-point. Therefore, the findings of less importance on rationality could be attributed to the biases of scaling as well as the true differences between the college students' career view and the prescriptive view. Similarly, the noticeable low ratio of the C might indicate the inappropriateness of the Holland-type item as well as other possibilities, such as sampling biases or the respondents' resistance to stereotyping.

Another limitation was related to cultural differences. Taiwanese career literature has a root in the US. The observed differences in this study could be cultural differences rather than the prescriptive vs. descriptive ones.

Despite of those limitations, the existence of various types of career views has been confirmed. Needs of individualized career theories and practice are in call. Career counselors should be sensitive to ones' own career view as well as the clients'. The Career View Framework and Questionnaire are helpful in doing so. Special attention should be paid to avoiding abusing rational approaches simply due to the counselor's familiarity and comfort. Secondly, the association between Holland's typology and career view is promising. They can be used to clarify each other during counseling process.

Future research could be directed to improve the psychometrical qualities of the measures on career view. Moreover, it would be of great value to examine college students' feelings toward

their career views and corresponding perception of the instrumentality.

References

- Arroba, T. (1977). Styles of decision-making and their use: An empirical study. British Journal of Guidance, 5, 149-158.
- Chin, S., Lin, H., Chen, C., & Ou, Y. (1984). Manual of Interest Inventory. Taipei: The College Entrance Examination Broad.
- Crites, J. O. (1981). Career counseling: Models, methods, and materials. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Gysbers, N. C. & Moore, E. J. (1987). Career counseling: Skills and techniques for practioners. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Katz, M. R. (1993). Computer-assisted career decision making: The guide in the machine. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Krieshok, T. S. (1998). An anti-introspectivist view of career decision making. The Career Development, 46, 210-229.
- Liu, S. (1996). Career view: What's missing in the career literature? Guidance Quarterly, 32, 52-59
- Liu, S. (in process). A reexamination of the Career View Framework: What go beyond rationality. Guidance Quarterly.
- Peterson, G. W., Sampson, J. P., & Reaeton, R. C. (1991). Career development and service: A cognitive approach. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Rubinton, N. (1980). Instruction in career decision making and decision-making styles. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 581-588.
- Sharf, R. S. (1992). Applying career development theory to counseling. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Spokane, A. R. (1996). Holland's theory. In D. Brown, L. Brooks, & associates. Career Choice and Development (3rd. ed., pp. 33-74). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Seventh International Counseling Conference, Sydney, 1998 Counseling in the 21st Century	
Author(s): William and Lois Evraiff (Compiled the Proceedings)	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: Dec. 1998

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

<p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sample</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____</p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> </div> <p>1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Level 1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 20px;">X</div>	<p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sample</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____</p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> </div> <p>2A</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Level 2A</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>	<p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sample</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____</p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> </div> <p>2B</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Level 2B</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>
--	--	--

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: <i>William Evraiff</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: William Evraiff, President	
Organization/Address: Northern California Graduate University 1710 S. Amphlett Blvd., #124, San Mateo, CA	Telephone: (650) 5261	FAX: (650) 573-8118
	E-Mail Address: admin@ncgu.edu	Date: 1/10/00

94402

ACES

(over)

