Wow, that was Quick!!!: Examining Brief Interactions Impact on Career Development

NCDA 2015 Denver, Colorado

Seth C.W. Hayden Ph.D.
Debra S. Osborn Ph.D.
James P. Sampson Jr. Ph.D.
INTRODUCTIONS

• Seth C.W. Hayden Ph.D. – Assistant Professor of Counseling
  • Wake Forest University

• Debra S. Osborn Ph.D. – Association Professor of EPLS
  • Florida State University

• James P. Sampson Jr. Ph.D. – Professor/Associate Dean
  • Florida State University
OVERVIEW OF DISCUSSION

- Discussion of Context
- Theoretical Basis of Study
- Explanation of Intervention
- Structure of Study
- Findings
- Implications
- Future Research
• Provide comprehensive career services
• Train career service practitioners
• Conduct life/career development research
• Disseminate information about life/career services and issues to the university community, the nation, and the world.
THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS: CIP THEORY

CASVE Cycle

Executive Processing Domain

Decision-Making Skills Domain

Knowledge Domains

Self Knowledge

Occupational Knowledge

Meta-cognitions

Communication

Identifying the problem - the gap

Analysis

Thinking about alternatives

Execution

Taking action to narrow the gap

Valuing

Prioritizing alternatives

Synthesis

Generating likely alternatives

Readiness Model

Complexity (high)

Low readiness

Moderate readiness

Capability (low)

Moderate readiness

High readiness

(High)

(low)
CIP Pyramid Domains

Thinking about my decision making

Knowing how I make decisions
(CASVE Cycle)

Knowing about myself
Knowing about my options

Client Version
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CASVE CYCLE

Knowing I Need to Make a Choice
Knowing I Made a Good Choice

Understanding Myself and My Options

Choosing An Occupation, Program of Study, or Job

Expanding and Narrowing My List of Options

Implementing My Choice

Communication

Execution

Synthesis

Analysis

Valuing
EXECUTIVE PROCESSING DOMAIN

• Metacognitions—Thinking about decision making
  • Self-talk
  • Self-awareness
  • Monitoring and Control
READINESS

The capability of an individual to make appropriate career choices taking into account the complexity of family, social, economic, and organizational factors that influence career development.

Readiness also includes possessing adequate language skills and literacy skills for communication and learning.

CIP READINESS MODEL

Complexity (high)

Low readiness
High degree of support needed
(Individual Case-Managed Services)

Capability (low)

Moderate readiness
Moderate to low degree of support needed
(Brief Staff-Assisted Services)

Moderate readiness
Moderate to low degree of support needed
(Brief Staff-Assisted Services)

High readiness
No support needed
(Self-Help Mode)
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ASSESSING READINESS

- Direct behavioral observations
- Career decision state
- Low-cost, theory-based assessments
- Psychological mental health appraisals

LEVELS OF SERVICE DELIVERY

- Self-Help Services
- Brief Staff-Assisted Services
- Individual Case-Managed Services
DIFFERENTIATED SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL

Individual Enters

Brief Screening

Self or Staff Referral

Comprehensive Screening

Self-Help Services

Brief Staff-Assisted Services

Individual Case-Managed Services

Complete differentiated model of delivering career resources and services
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PRACTICAL STRATEGIES
Career Thoughts Inventory™ (CTI™)
Test Booklet

James P. Sampson, Jr., PhD
Gary W. Peterson, PhD
Janet G. Lenz, PhD
Robert C. Reardon, PhD
Denise E. Saunders, MS

This inventory has been developed to help people learn more about the way they think about career choices. Inside this booklet you will find statements describing thoughts that some people have when considering career choices. Please answer each statement openly and honestly as it describes you.

Directions:
Read each statement carefully and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each item by circling the answer that best describes you. Do not omit any items.

SD = Strongly Disagree   D = Disagree   A = Agree   SA = Strongly Agree
DECISION SPACE WORKSHEET (DSW)

• Assessing personal and social context
• A measure of complexity

SAMPLE DSWS
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# Individual Learning Plan

**Goal(s) #1** Clarify interests and ascertain readiness for career counseling  
- #2 Explore options for a graduate degree  
- #3 Improve peer networking skills at work  
- #4 Increase social interactions among family members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Purpose/Outcome</th>
<th>Estimated Time Commitment</th>
<th>Goal #</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual career counseling to foster self exploration</td>
<td>Enhance knowledge of self and career options</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>1, 2, &amp; 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the Career Thoughts Inventory</td>
<td>Ascertain potential dysfunctional career thoughts</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Self-Directed Search</td>
<td>Enhance self knowledge</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore potential graduate degree programs of interest</td>
<td>Enhance knowledge of options</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice interacting with other people at work and in neighborhood</td>
<td>Gain self-observation skills and experience in interactions with peers</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out referral to university counseling center for family counseling*</td>
<td>Improve quality of family relationships related to career choice and support</td>
<td>One week</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ned

Student/Client__________________________________________Date_____________________

*This activity may be conducted in a career center if counselor possesses appropriate skills and training.*
MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS

• Beck Depression Inventory
• Beck Hopelessness Inventory
• Clinical Interview
• MMPI
• Early Memories
RESEARCH ON OUR BRIEF-ASSISTED MODEL

• Why: to help us determine if it does what we think it does

• Background:
  • Career centers are seeing increasing numbers of clients with stagnant or decreasing numbers of staff.
  • Career interventions are effective (Brown, 2014; Brown & Ryan-Krane, 2000)
  • Recommendations to integrate career and mental health (Amundson, Borgen, Iaqunit, Butterfield, & Koert, 2012; Schaub, 2012)
  • Relationship with career counselor contributes to a "successful" experience (Elad-Strenger & Littman-Ovadia, 2012)
  • Multiple studies point to the value of brief interventions
    • workshops (Dik & Steger, 2008; Tillotson & Osborn, 2011)
    • career courses (Folsom & Reardon, 2000; Osborn, Howard, & Leierer, 2007)
  • BUT - No research on the delivery of brief-assisted career delivery models or on career-theory based models
RESEARCH ON OUR BRIEF-ASSISTED MODEL

• Who: 128 drop-in volunteer clients
  • 60% female, age 17-39 years
  • 60% White, 17% Latino, 12% Black, 6% Asian, 6% Other
  • Nearly equally divided among educational status
WHAT?

• What is the effect of a brief-assisted career counseling model on general outcomes?

• What are the attitudes of drop-in clients regarding the effectiveness of a brief-assisted career counseling model?

• What is the relationship between process characteristics and changes in outcome variables?
  • (pre and post test scores on knowledge, confidence, anxiety; post test feelings, thoughts about counseling interactions, etc.)
HOW

• Pre/Post Surveys

• Session Rating Scale
  • Duncan, Miller, Sparks, Calud, Reynolds, Brown, & Johnson, 2003
  • Cronbach’s alpha: .88; this study .94

• ANOVA and Correlations
### ANOVA PRE/POST TEST RESULTS

Comparisons between Pre-intervention and Post-intervention Scores on Brief Staff-Assisted Outcomes (n = 138)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Pre-intervention M</th>
<th>Pre-intervention SD</th>
<th>Post-intervention M</th>
<th>Post-intervention SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>Percent of Change Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of next steps</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>36.22</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confidence in next steps</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anxiety about concern</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
**p < .001

a. 5-point scale, 5 = Strongly agree, 1 = Strongly disagree
b. 4-point scale, 1 = not at all anxious, 2 = A little anxious, 3 = Moderately anxious, 4 = Very anxious
c. Change score = (post-intervention minus pre-intervention)

Significant changes on each variable
Medium ES for knowledge & confidence
Small ES for anxiety
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## CHANGE RESULTS (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive (posttest&gt;pretest)</th>
<th>Neutral (posttest=pretest)</th>
<th>Negative (posttest&lt;pretest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge (increased)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence (increased)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety (decreased) (reduced anxiety)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11 (increased anxiety)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**PROCESS INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Session Rating Scale Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>40 - 6</td>
<td>84.8% 36 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Made progress on career concern&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>5 - 1</td>
<td>84.0% agree or strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Felt positive about accomplishment&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>92.8% agree or strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Career advisor assisted me with strategies&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>5 - 2</td>
<td>93.4% agree or strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Need for additional service&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>26.3% none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 4 items, 10-point scale, 10 = high, 1 = low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.2% brief walk-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 5-point scale, 5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6% individual counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 3-point scale, 1 = none, 2 = brief walk-in, 3 = individual counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CORRELATIONS

Among Process & Change Scores for Brief Staff-Assisted Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Made progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Felt positive</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advisor interaction</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Session Rating Scale Total</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Needs additional service</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge of next steps</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Confidence in next steps</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anxiety about career concern</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
SUMMARY & IMPLICATIONS

• Brief-assisted model works – for some

• Brief-assisted model rated positively – by most

• Context of high levels of training, supervision and physical resources

• Counselors using this approach may need to adjust to briefer sessions

• Attend to both cognitive and emotional considerations, especially initial anxiety
FUTURE RESEARCH

• What client or counselor characteristics may account for outcome differences? Possibly:
  • Types of career concerns
  • Client expectations
  • Counselor-client relationship
  • Type of intervention
  • Physical environment of session
  • Time demands

• Changes in anxiety unrelated to process variables – what did cause the change?
• Seth Hayden – haydensc@wfu.edu
• Debra Osborn – dosborn@fsu.edu
• James P. Sampson Jr. – jsampson@admin.fsu.edu

FSU Tech Center – http://career.fsu.edu/Tech-Center/NCDA-2015
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